



2006–2007

Accountability Manual

The 2006–2007 Annual School
and District Report Card
System for South Carolina
Public Schools and School
Districts

PO Box 11867
Blatt Building, Rm 227
Columbia, SC 29211

www.sceoc.org

June 2006



Contents

Introduction

Section I	System Preamble and Purposes	1
	Components of the System	2
	Definitions of Critical Terms	5
	Manual Organization	6

Ratings Criteria

Section II	Identification of School/Program Units for Report Cards	7
	Criteria for and Calculation of School and District Ratings	8
	Student Performance Categories	9
	Ratings for Schools Enrolling Students in Only Grade Two or Below	10
	Ratings for Schools Enrolling Students in Grades Three through Eight	15
	Ratings for High Schools	28
	Ratings for Career and Technology Centers	33
	Ratings for School Districts	37
	Ratings for Special Schools	43

Methodology

Section III	2007 Accountability Rating Criteria and Standards	57
	Inclusion of New Assessments in Ratings	57
	Process for Determining Criteria for School/District Profile Information	57
	Minimum Size Requirements	57
	Quantitative Parameters for Each Rating Category	57
	Reporting of Subgroup Performance	58
	Ratings Conditional on the Performance of Student Subgroups	58
	Data Reported as "N/A" (School and District Report Cards)	58
Section IV	Longitudinally Matched Data	59
Section V	Schools Similar in Student Characteristics	60
	Districts and Schools Similar in Student Characteristics	60
	Building School Groups	60
Section VI	Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Criteria	61
	Statutory Authority	61
	Overview	61
	Criteria and Procedures	62
	Criteria for Selecting Schools for Awards: Grades Three through Eight, Career and Technology Centers, and Special Schools	62
	Criteria for Selecting Schools for Awards: High Schools	65
	Allocation of Funds and Non-Achievement Criteria	66

System Review and Changes

Section VII	Report Card Information and Presentation	67
	General Design Issues	67

Section VIII System Safeguards	68
Ratings Impact	68
Serious Data Problems	68
Ratings Changes	68
Analyses Undertaken Prior to the Release of Ratings	68
Analyses Undertaken After the Release of Ratings	69
Section IX Local Responsibilities	70
Section X Preview of the 2007–2008 Accountability System.....	71
System Evolution.....	71
Schedule for Studies of and Changes to School and District Report Card Ratings	72
Section XI Additional Information.....	75
Calendar for 2006–2007	75
Persons to Call with Questions	75
Appendixes	75
Appendix A: The Education Accountability Act of 1998 (as Amended in 2006) and 2006-2007 Appropriations Act Provisos Related to the Accountability System	
Appendix B: 2003–2005 Report Card Ratings and Changes Recommended	
B-1: South Carolina School and District Ratings, 2003 - 2005	
B-2: Review of Primary School Ratings Criteria and Recommendations for their Revision	
B-3: Revision of High School Report Card Ratings: Replacement of LIFE Scholarship Criterion With End-of-Course Test Performance	
Appendix C: Definitions and Formulas for School or District Profile Information	
Appendix D: Table of Specifications by School or District for Report Card Data	

Section I INTRODUCTION

The *Accountability Manual* is a technical resource to explain South Carolina's public education accountability system. The accountability system is designed to promote high levels of student achievement through strong and effective schools.

This manual addresses the ratings and reporting processes for the November 2007 report cards.

System Preamble and Purposes

The Education Accountability Act of 1998 provides the foundation for the South Carolina accountability system. The enabling legislation in the annotated Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976, included the following preamble and purposes:

§ 59-18-100. The General Assembly finds that South Carolinians have a commitment to public education and a conviction that high expectations for all students are vital components for improving academic achievement. It is the purpose of the General Assembly in this chapter to establish a performance based accountability system for public education which focuses on improving teaching and learning so that students are equipped with a strong academic foundation. Accountability, as defined by this chapter, means acceptance of the responsibility for improving student performance and taking actions to improve classroom practice and school performance by the Governor, the General Assembly, the State Department of Education, colleges and universities, local school boards, administrators, teachers, parents, students and the community.

§ 59-18-110. The system is to:

- (1) Use academic achievement standards to push schools and students toward higher performance by aligning the state assessment to those standards and linking policies and criteria for performance standards, accreditation, reporting, school rewards, and targeted assistance;
- (2) Provide an annual report card with a performance indicator system that is logical, reasonable, fair, challenging, and technically defensible which furnishes clear and specific information about school and district academic performance and other performance to parents and the public;
- (3) Require all districts to establish local accountability systems to stimulate quality teaching and learning practices and target assistance to low performing schools;
- (4) Provide resources to strengthen the process of teaching and learning in the classroom to improve student performance and reduce gaps in performance;
- (5) Support professional development as integral to improvement and to the actual work of teachers and school staff; and
- (6) Expand the ability to evaluate the system and to conduct in-depth studies on implementation, efficiency and the effectiveness of academic improvement efforts.

Components of the System

Ratings

Beginning with the 2001 report cards, each school and district has received two state accountability system ratings, one for absolute performance level and one for improvement rate:

- ❑ **Absolute Rating:** The level of a school's academic performance on achievement measures for the current school year;
- ❑ **Improvement Rating:** The level of growth in academic performance when comparing current performance to the previous year's performance (based on longitudinally matched student data and on differences between cohorts of students when longitudinal data are not available.) Improvement Ratings also reflect reductions in achievement gaps between majority groups and historically underachieving groups of students as well as sustained high levels of school or district achievement.

The five rating terms are Excellent, Good, Average, Below Average, and Unsatisfactory.

- ❑ **Excellent:** School performance substantially exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 South Carolina performance goal.
- ❑ **Good:** School performance exceeds the standards for progress toward the 2010 South Carolina performance goal.
- ❑ **Average:** School performance meets the standards for progress toward the 2010 South Carolina performance goal.
- ❑ **Below Average:** School is in jeopardy of not meeting the standards for progress toward the 2010 South Carolina performance goal.
- ❑ **Unsatisfactory:** School performance fails to meet the standards for progress toward the 2010 South Carolina performance goal.

In addition to the state accountability system ratings, each school and district will receive an indicator of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) based on the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation. AYP specifies annual targets for the testing and achievement of all students and of specific demographic subgroups. Information regarding the AYP indicators is available from the South Carolina Department of Education (www.myschools.com).

Standards-Based Assessments

The standards-based assessment system used in the development of school ratings includes the grades three through eight Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests in mathematics, reading/English language arts (ELA), science, and social studies; the revised exit examination (HSAP); and end-of-course assessments for selected high school courses.

The availability of assessments is dependent upon the development schedule approved by the State Board of Education and shown below:

Timeline for Implementation of New Assessments

Test	'98– '99	'99– '00	'00– '01	'01– '02	'02– '03	'03– '04	'04– '05	'05– '06	'06– '07	'07– '08
Readiness 1, 2				X						
PACT 1, 2		Deleted from EAA in 2001								
PACT 3–8 Math, ELA	X									
PACT 3–8 Science					X					
PACT 3–8 Social Studies					X					
HSAP Exit Exam Math, ELA						X				
HSAP Exit Exam Science	Not scheduled									
HSAP Exit Exam Social Studies										
End-of-Course Algebra I					X					
End-of-Course English I						X				
End-of-Course Physical Science and Biology I						X				
End-of-Course U.S. History									X	
PACT Alternate Assess, Grades 3– 8			X							
PACT Alternate Assess, High School						X				

X = year assessment first administered

Source: State Department of Education, May 31, 2005

For the November 2007 report cards, the following assessments are used in the calculation of school and district ratings:

- ❑ Schools enrolling students only in kindergarten through grade two: Criteria other than assessment data (e.g., prime instructional time, pupil-teacher ratios, parent involvement, external accreditation, early-childhood professional development, percentage of

teachers having advanced degrees, and percentage of teachers returning from the previous year) are used for the rating.

- ❑ Schools enrolling students in grades three through eight: 2006 and 2007 PACT ELA, math, science and social studies data for 2007 report card.
- ❑ Schools enrolling students in grades nine through twelve: first attempt High School Assessment Program (HSAP) results, longitudinal HSAP results, percentages of end-of-course test scores of 70 or higher, and four-year graduation rates.
- ❑ Career and technology centers: Percentages of students mastering core competencies or certification requirements in center courses, along with graduation and placement rates.
- ❑ Special schools: Criteria appropriate for each school's mission.
- ❑ Districts: Assessments used for calculating the ratings for schools enrolling students in grades three through eight and high schools are used to calculate the district ratings. In addition to the assessments, the high school four-year graduation rate and end-of-course test results also are included in the calculation of district ratings. (Note: Assessment results from students attending charter schools authorized by a local school district will be used for calculating ratings for the charter schools but not for the local school district.)

School Profile Information

School or district profiles provide information about aspects of the educational environment over which the school community has influence and that affect performance.

Annual analyses of these and other data elements are to be conducted to determine the relationship to student academic performance.

Flexibility Status

Schools meeting certain requirements may be released from compliance with specific regulations and statutory provisions.

- ❑ For schools with exemplary performance: A school is given the flexibility of receiving exemptions from regulations and statutory provisions governing the defined program provided that, during a three-year period, the following criteria are satisfied:
 - the school has twice been a recipient of a Palmetto Gold or Silver Award, pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 59-18-1100 (Supp. 2002);
 - the school has met annual improvement standards for subgroups of students in reading and mathematics; and
 - the school has exhibited no recurring accreditation deficiencies.

Schools receiving flexibility status are released from those regulations and statutory provisions referred to above including, but not limited to, regulations and statutory provisions on class scheduling, class structure, and staffing.

To continue to receive flexibility pursuant to this section, a school must annually exhibit school improvement at or above the state average as computed in the school recognition program pursuant to § 59-18-1100 and must meet the gains required for subgroups of students in reading and mathematics. A school that does not re-qualify for flexibility status due to extenuating circumstances may apply to the State Board of Education for an extension of this status for one year.

In the event that a school is removed from flexibility status, the school is not subject to regulations and statutory provisions exempted under this section until the beginning of the school year following notification of the change in status by the State Department of Education. Subsequent monitoring by the State Department of Education in a school that is removed from flexibility status will not include a review of program records exempted under this section for the period that the school has received flexibility status or for the school year during which the school was notified of its removal from flexibility status.

- ❑ For schools designated as Unsatisfactory: A school designated as Unsatisfactory while in such status is given the flexibility of receiving exemptions from those regulations and statutory provisions governing the defined program or other State Board of Education regulations, dealing with the core academic areas as outlined in § 59-18-120, provided that the review team recommends such flexibility to the State Board of Education.
- ❑ For other schools: Other schools may receive flexibility when their strategic plan explains why such exemptions are expected to improve the academic performance of the students and the plan meets the approval by the State Board of Education. To continue to receive flexibility pursuant to this section, a school must annually exhibit overall school improvement as outlined in its revised plan and must meet the gains set for subgroups of students in reading and mathematics. A school that does not re-qualify for flexibility status due to extenuating circumstances may apply to the State Board of Education for an extension of this status for one year according to the provisions of § 59-18-1110(D).

Definitions of Critical Terms (S.C. Code Ann. § 59-18-120, Supp. 2006)

Oversight committee: The Education Oversight Committee (EOC) established in Section 59-6-10.

Standards-based assessment: An assessment in which an individual's performance is compared to specific performance standards and not to the performance of other students.

Disaggregated data: Data broken out for specific groups within the total student population, such as by race, gender, and family income level.

Longitudinally matched student data: Data used to examine the performance of a single student or a group of students by considering their test scores over time.

Norm-referenced assessment: Assessments designed to compare student performance to a nationally representative sample of similar students known as the norm group.

Academic achievement standards: Statements of expectations for student learning.

Department: The State Department of Education.

Absolute performance: The rating a school will receive based on the percentage of students meeting standard on the state's standards-based assessment.

Improvement performance: The rating a school will receive based on longitudinally matched student data comparing current performance to the previous year's for the purpose of determining student academic growth.

Objective and reliable statewide assessment: Assessments that yield consistent results; that measure the cognitive knowledge and skills specified in the state-approved academic standards; that do not include questions relative to personal opinions, feelings, or attitudes; and that are not biased with regard to race, gender, or socioeconomic status. The assessments must include a writing assessment and multiple-choice questions designed to reflect a range of cognitive abilities beyond the knowledge level. Constructive response questions may be included as a component of the writing assessment.

Division of Accountability: The special unit within the Education Oversight Committee established in Section 59-6-100.

Ratings year: The academic year of the state test data that are incorporated into the performance level rating.

Formative assessment: Assessments used within the school year to analyze general strengths and weaknesses in learning and instruction, to understand the performance of students individually and across achievement categories, to adapt instruction to meet students' needs, and to consider placement and planning for the next grade level. Data and performance from the formative assessments must not be used in the calculation of school or district ratings.

Manual Organization

The organization of this manual is structured to provide state and local education agencies with details regarding the implementation of the accountability system and to enable those agencies to plan for meaningful and accurate data collections, to work with their professional colleagues and public toward understanding of the elements reported, and to ensure that the system improves continuously.

Section II Ratings Criteria

Identification of School/Program Units for Report Cards

Report cards are to be issued for each school or district, to include the following:

- ❑ Each school or district organizational unit assigned a Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) code by the State Department of Education.
- ❑ Each special school operating under the auspices of the State of South Carolina, including those operated by the Department of Juvenile Justice, the Felton Laboratory School at South Carolina State University, the Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities, the Governor's School for Science and Mathematics, the John de la Howe School, the Palmetto Unified School District, the S.C. School for the Deaf and the Blind, and the Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School.
- ❑ Multiple report cards will be issued only if there are sufficient numbers of students in each group to meet the criteria for reporting disaggregated data (see Minimum Size Requirements, page 57 of this manual). When multiple report cards are issued for a school, data elements that are specific to the different grade levels will be different. All other data elements will be identical. In a school with grades seven through twelve, for example, the report card for grades seven and eight will include the number of students enrolled in courses for high school credit, while the report card for grades nine through twelve will include the number of students successfully completing AP/IB courses. Other data, such as attendance rates, will be identical on the two report cards. Each report card will contain unique measures of absolute performance and improvement performance to the extent that the methods that are adopted for those ratings depend on data that are routinely collected by grade level. If data that are not routinely collected by grade level are used to construct or to interpret the ratings, then identical information for these data will appear on all report cards issued for the school.

Superintendents may request that separate report cards be issued for special program units that meet the following criteria and that would not otherwise receive a separate report card:

- The program unit is a multi-grade unit directed toward a purpose (either curriculum, special population, or distinct methodology) housed on the campus of a BEDS-designated school.
- The program unit has an administrative leadership structure separate from the school that houses the program.
- The program unit is acknowledged generally by parents and the public to be separate and distinct from the school that houses the program.
- There is no overlap between the grades served by the program unit, any other program unit housed at the school, and the host school.

Requests for separate report cards must be made to the state superintendent of education by the first day of the school year preceding the report card year. The state superintendent will approve or deny such requests.

- ❑ A typical elementary school is defined as containing kindergarten through grade five; a typical middle school, grades six through eight; a typical high school, grades nine through twelve. Any school that includes a grade on either side of the typical pattern will be viewed as part of that organizational pattern. For example, if a school includes kindergarten through grade six, it will be considered elementary. If a school includes grades five through nine, it will be considered a middle school. If a school includes two or more grades on either side of the typical pattern (e.g., grades four through eight), two report cards will be produced. Due to the differences in data included in ratings for high school grades, any school that contains grade ten and crosses organizational patterns will require at least two report cards. A school containing grade 9 only will not have the data for calculating school ratings, but the school will receive a report card listing all data but the ratings.

Criteria for and Calculation of School and District Ratings

District rating approaches will parallel those used at the school level. Depending on the method selected, district ratings will be calculated by aggregating student-level data. Student assessment results from the PACT Alternate and HSAP Alternate Assessments will be included in the calculation of the district but not the school ratings. Results from high school end-of-course assessments will be included in the calculation of high school and district ratings following the third administration of the assessments. End-of-course test results were included in the calculation of district ratings beginning in 2006, and will be included in the high school ratings beginning in 2007. The four-year high school graduation rate is an additional criterion to test results for calculating high school and school district ratings.

Students Included in the Ratings

- ❑ Absolute performance ratings for schools: Any student who is in membership in a school at the time of the 45-day enrollment count and is present in the school on the first day of testing will be included in the absolute performance rating for a school for the ratings year if he or she was enrolled at the time of testing. (Therefore, students in membership but temporarily assigned to an alternative program are counted in the home school.) Students who have taken at least one complete subject area test (e.g., mathematics) will be included. Data from students repeating a grade are included in the calculation of the ratings.

Data from special education students administered the PACT tests with accommodations or modifications will be used for the calculation of school and district ratings. Scores from these students will be treated in the ratings calculations in the same manner as those from PACT administered in its standard format. Data from the results of modified administrations will also be treated in the ratings calculations in the same manner as data from the standard administration of PACT. Data from students administered the PACT Alternate Assessment will be used in the calculation of district ratings only. Data from students having Limited English Proficiency (LEP) will be used in school and district ratings as available in accordance with federal regulations.

- ❑ Absolute performance ratings for districts: Any student who is enrolled in a district at the time of the 45-day enrollment count and on the first day of testing will be included in the absolute performance rating for a district for the ratings year, even if he or she has changed schools within the district. All other conditions stipulated for schools will apply for district ratings. The Education Accountability Act was amended in 2006 (Section 59-18-920) to direct that data from students attending a charter school authorized by a local school district

are not to be included in the calculation of the local school district ratings. Ratings for charter schools authorized by a local school district are to be reported separately on the school district report card.

The student performance data for students attending multi-district schools in which 100 percent of the students have Individualized Education Plans and in which 90 percent or more of the students are assessed with the PACT Alternate or HSAP Alternate Assessments should be included in the data reported for each student's home district. The data from students attending such special schools also will be reported on the special school's report card.

Mobile students are of particular importance to the accountability system. The EOC will study the impact of student mobility on the accountability system.

- ❑ Improvement ratings for grades three through eight: Any student will be included if he or she is enrolled in a school (or district) on the forty-fifth day, can be matched to the previous year, and has PACT test scores for both years, even if the student attended a different school during the previous year. The percentage of matched students will be reported on the report card and will be calculated by dividing the number of students for whom current test data were matched with test data from the previous school year by the total number of students for whom current year test data are available. Longitudinally matched data from all PACT subtests (ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies) will be used for calculating improvement ratings.

Student Performance Categories

The State Board of Education, through the State Department of Education, is mandated to adopt or develop standards-based assessments in mathematics, English language arts (ELA), science, and social studies for grades three through eight, an exit examination to be first administered in grade ten, and end-of-course tests for gateway courses for grades nine through twelve.

Each test is to be reviewed and approved by the Education Oversight Committee. To date, the mathematics, English language arts, science, and social studies tests for grades three through eight (Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests, or PACT) and the PACT Alternate Assessment have been reviewed and approved for use (results from the PACT science and social studies tests were included in the calculation of the school and district ratings beginning with the November 2005 report card). The High School Assessment Program (HSAP) in ELA and math and the end-of-course tests in English I, Algebra I/Math for the Technologies II, Physical Science, and Biology I have also been approved for use and their results were included in the calculation of district ratings beginning in 2006. End-of-course test results will be used for the calculation of high school ratings beginning in 2007. First-attempt HSAP results (percent of students scoring at or above the "2" performance level) were used in the calculation of high school and district ratings beginning with the November 2004 report card. The percentage of students scoring at the "2" level or above on both the HSAP tests within two years after taking the tests for the first time ("longitudinal HSAP") were used in the calculation of the high school and district ratings beginning in 2006.

Baseline administration of PACT ELA and mathematics was conducted in Spring 1999, and baseline administration of PACT Science and Social Studies was conducted in Spring 2003. Based on data collected and a book-marking procedure, performance-level standards were established. Four performance levels—Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced—indicate

how an individual student is performing based on the curriculum standards assessed by the PACT.

PACT Performance Levels

Below Basic

A student who performs at the Below Basic level on the PACT has not met minimum expectations for student performance based on the curriculum standards approved by the State Board of Education. The student is not prepared for work at the next grade and must have an academic assistance plan; local district board policy will determine the student's promotion to the next grade level.

Basic

Performance at the Basic level means a student has passed the test. A student who performs at the Basic level on the PACT has met minimum expectations for student performance based on the curriculum standards approved by the State Board of Education. The student is minimally prepared for work at the next grade.

Proficient

A student who performs at the Proficient level on the PACT has met expectations for student performance based on the curriculum standards approved by the State Board of Education. The student is well prepared for work at the next grade. The Proficient level represents the long-term goal for student performance in South Carolina.

Advanced

A student who performs at the Advanced level on the PACT has exceeded expectations for student performance based on the curriculum standards approved by the State Board of Education. The student is very well prepared for work at the next grade.

Ratings for Schools Enrolling Students in Only Grade Two or Below

During the 2004–2005 school year, 28 schools served students enrolled in only grade two or below. These schools pose a complex challenge to the accountability system. Achievement testing is neither required nor recommended. The education of young children involves assisting them with developmental tasks as well as the acquisition of content that is the focus of upper grades. The model for accountability recommended below focuses not on test behaviors but on other correlates of school success. The model focuses on teacher behaviors, on classroom and school practices, and on parental and child behaviors that research indicates are related to school success.

Two ratings are to be assigned to schools. The ratings for absolute performance and improvement performance are defined in article 1 of the Education Accountability Act of 1998, Section 59-18-120:

“Absolute performance” means the rating a school will receive based on the percentage of students meeting standard on the state’s standards based assessment.

“Improvement performance” means the rating a school will receive based on longitudinally matched student data comparing current performance to the previous year’s performance for the purpose of determining student academic growth.

As required by the United States Department of Education through passage of the No Child Left Behind legislation, a notice of each school’s attainment of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) must be reported. AYP specifies statewide targets for percent tested and achievement to be met by all students and by specific demographic groups. Information on the determination of AYP is available from the South Carolina Department of Education (www.myschools.com).

Ratings Criteria

In 2005 the primary school ratings criteria were reviewed by Education Oversight Committee (EOC) staff and by an advisory committee composed of primary school principals and other early childhood educators. The purpose of the review was to develop recommendations regarding revisions of the criteria needed to improve their accuracy and usefulness for evaluating primary school quality. The process followed for this review of the primary school ratings involved three steps:

- A review of the research literature pertaining to the measurement of the quality and performance of primary schools;
- An analysis of South Carolina primary and elementary school performance and school profile data;
- Consultation with a Primary Ratings Advisory Committee to review the research and data analyses and identify appropriate criteria for determining primary school ratings.

Based on this process, recommendations for the revision of the ratings were adopted by the EOC in February 2006 to include the following criteria (see Appendix B-2 for the report and recommendations made to the EOC):

- ❑ Prime instructional time: Prime instructional time is a measure of the amount of school instructional time during which both teachers and students are present and is calculated in the same manner as for other South Carolina schools. (See section C of the *Accountability Manual* for the formula.)
- ❑ Pupil-teacher ratios: Pupil-teacher ratio is calculated by dividing the number of students enrolled in the school on the forty-fifth day of school by the total number of teachers in the school (excluding counselors, librarians, administrative personnel, specialists, and teachers of the arts, physical education, or special education).
- ❑ Parent involvement: Involvement is calculated by dividing the number of students in the schools whose parents/guardians attend at least one individual parent conference (unduplicated count) during the school year by the 135th-day average daily membership (ADM).
- ❑ External accreditation: Accreditation that is early childhood specific is determined by application and/or receipt of accreditation. The scale ranges from State Department of Education accreditation through early childhood specific accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to the accreditation by the American Montessori Society or the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

- ❑ Professional development: The professional development time devoted exclusively to knowledge and skills working with young children (less than eight years) is calculated.
- ❑ Percentage of teachers having advanced degrees: Percentage of teachers having advanced degrees, a measure of the qualifications of the teachers in the school, is calculated in the same manner as for other South Carolina schools. (See section C of the *Accountability Manual* for the formula.)
- ❑ Percentage of teachers returning from the previous school year: Percentage of teachers returning from the previous school year, a measure of the instructional continuity and stability, is calculated in the same manner as for other South Carolina schools. (See section C of the *Accountability Manual* for the formula.) Note: To ensure that sufficient data are available, this variable is calculated only for schools that have been in operation for four years or more, so ratings will not be calculated for primary schools in operation for less than four years.

Absolute Rating Calculation

The Absolute Ratings are calculated using a mathematical formula that results in an index. The absolute index is calculated using a mathematical formula in which point weights are assigned to the ratings criteria listed in the following table:

Absolute Ratings Criteria for Schools with Only Grade Two or Below

Criterion (Weight)	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
Prime Instructional Time (14.3%)	95.2% or greater	91.4–95.1%	83.8–91.3%	80.0–83.7%	Less than 80.0%
Pupil-Teacher Ratio (14.3%)	21 or less	22-25	26-30	31-32	Greater than 32
Parent Involvement (14.3%)	99.9% or greater	99.3–99.8 %	97.6–99.2%	96.8–97.5%	Less than 96.8%
External Accreditation (14.3%)	NAEYC or Montessori	SDE and SACS-early childhood	SDE	Conducting self-study	Not pursuing accreditation
Professional Development on Educational Needs of Children Under 8 Years of Age (14.3%)	1.5 days or greater	1.0 to 1.5 days	1.0 day	0.5 to 0.9 days	Less than 0.5 day
Teachers with Advanced Degrees (14.3%)	80.3% or greater	66.6-80.2%	39.2-66.5%	25.5-39.1%	Less than 25.5%
Teachers Returning from Previous Year (14.3%)	99.1% or greater	93.7-99.0%	82.8-93.6%	77.3-82.7%	Less than 77.3%

The index is calculated by adding the points (weights or values) assigned to each rating criterion in the table above and dividing the total points by the number of criteria (7) used to calculate the ratings. The index is then rounded to the nearest one-tenth of a point.

The resulting index determines the school's Absolute Rating as follows:

Index Values for Determining Absolute Ratings

Year	Range of Indexes Corresponding to Absolute Rating				
	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
2006	3.7 and above*	3.3–3.6*	2.9–3.2	2.5–2.8	Below 2.5
2007	3.8 and above*	3.4–3.7*	3.0–3.3	2.6–2.9	Below 2.6
2008	3.9 and above*	3.5–3.8*	3.1–3.4	2.7–3.0	Below 2.7
2009	4.0 and above*	3.6–3.9*	3.2–3.5	2.8–3.1	Below 2.8
2010	4.1 and above*	3.7–4.0*	3.3–3.6	2.9–3.2	Below 2.9

*School must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives for the category "all students."

The Absolute Rating of schools receiving an Excellent or Good rating initially may be decreased one rating category if the schools have not met Adequate Yearly Progress (i.e., the AYP performance and percent-tested criteria must be met) for the category “all students,” calculated by using available data for the entire student body in the school for the same school year as used to calculate the Absolute Ratings. Absolute ratings will not be decreased if AYP for subgroups is not met when AYP based on “all students” has been achieved. For example, if a school had an absolute index of 3.7 in 2006 but did not achieve AYP for “all students” in 2006, its rating would be lowered from Excellent to Good. A school in 2006 with an index of 3.3 that did not achieve AYP for “all students” in 2006 would be awarded an Absolute Rating of Average rather than Good.

Sample Calculation of an Absolute Rating for a K–2 Only School

Prime instructional time is 92 percent:	4 points
Pupil-teacher ratio is 26 to 1:	3 points
Parent involvement is 65 percent:	1 point
External accreditation from SDE:	3 points
Professional development is .5 day:	2 points
Teachers with advanced degrees is 80%:	4 points
Teachers returning is 91%:	<u>3 points</u>
Total Points:	20 points
Divided by 7 (number of criteria):	2.9 Index
Absolute Rating:	Below Average

Note: This school's index of 2.9 corresponds to a Below Average Absolute Rating through the year 2010.

Additional Step if Absolute Rating is Excellent or Good:

Did the school meet AYP for the category “all students?” Yes/No.

If the school's Absolute Rating is Excellent or Good but the school did not meet AYP for “all students,” the Absolute Rating would be lowered by one level—from Excellent to Good or from Good to Average.

Improvement Rating Values

For schools enrolling students in only grade two or below, the Improvement Rating will be calculated based upon the change in the absolute performance rating index from year to year.

Note: Longitudinal student data are not available.

The Improvement Ratings are calculated using a mathematical formula that results in an index. The index is calculated by subtracting the school's Absolute Rating index for the prior year from the Absolute Rating index for the year on which the report card is based. (Note: Since the ratings criteria will differ between 2005-2006 and 2006-2007, 2006-2007 primary school Improvement Ratings will be determined by recalculating the 2005-2006 school index to include the revised ratings criteria before subtracting it from the 2006-2007 index.) The amount of change determines the rating as follows:

Improvement Rating Index Values

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	0.4 or greater
Good	0.3
Average	0.1–0.2
Below Average	0.0
Unsatisfactory	-0.1 or less

Sample Calculation of an Improvement Rating for a K–2 School

Absolute ratings index for school year for which report card is based:	2.4
Absolute rating index for the prior school year:	<u>-2.2</u>
Difference:	0.2
Improvement Rating:	Average

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Subsequent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and immediately previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

Ratings for Schools Enrolling Students in Grades Three through Eight

Schools enrolling students in grades three through eight will receive ratings in accordance with the grade organization patterns and rules established in the *Accountability Manual*

Ratings Criteria

Two ratings are to be assigned to schools. The ratings for absolute performance and improvement performance are defined in article 1 of the Education Accountability Act of 1998, Section 59-18-120:

“Absolute performance” means the rating a school will receive based on the percentage of students meeting standard on the state’s standards based assessment;

“Improvement performance” means the rating a school will receive based on longitudinally matched student data comparing current performance to their previous year’s performance for the purpose of determining student academic growth.

As required by the United States Department of Education through passage of the No Child Left Behind legislation, a notice of each school’s attainment of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) must be reported. AYP specifies statewide targets for percent tested and achievement to be met by all students and by specific demographic groups. Information on the determination of AYP is available from the South Carolina Department of Education (www.myschools.com).

Absolute Performance Rating

The absolute performance level is calculated on the basis of a weighted model in which student performance weights are assigned. A weighted model is one in which the percentage of student scores in each category is weighted to represent the importance of scoring in that category, as follows: Advanced, five points; Proficient, four points; Basic, three points; Below Basic 2, two points; and Below Basic 1, one point. (The Below Basic performance category has been split into two subcategories—Below Basic 2 and Below Basic 1—so that improvement among low-scoring students is recognized.) The determination for the break point for Below Basic 2 and Below Basic 1 is two standard errors of measurement below the Basic cut point. The standard error of measurement values used were published in the *Technical Documentation for the 1999 Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests of English Language Arts and Mathematics, Grades Three through Eight* (Huynh et al., 2000) for English Language Arts and Mathematics and the *Technical Documentation for the 2003 Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests of English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies* (SDE, no date) for Science and Social Studies. The following tables provide the score ranges and cut points for each score category for each grade and subject area. Score ranges and cut points for the four performance levels were determined by the State Department of Education.

**PACT English Language Arts Cut-Off Scale Scores
For Use in Calculating Absolute Ratings**

Grade	Below Basic 1	Below Basic 2	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
8	LT 792	792	797	813	827
7	LT 691	691	696	712	729
6	LT 590	590	596	612	629
5	LT 488	488	495	511	531
4	LT 389	389	395	410	430
3	LT 290	290	296	310	331
2	LT 183	183	194	207	NA
1	LT 80	80	91	107	NA

LT = Less Than

**PACT Mathematics Cut-Off Scale Scores
For Use in Calculating Absolute Ratings**

Grade	Below Basic 1	Below Basic 2	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
8	LT 793	793	800	818	827
7	LT 691	691	700	717	727
6	LT 591	591	599	617	628
5	LT 490	490	499	517	528
4	LT 389	389	399	416	427
3	LT 290	290	298	316	326
2	LT 183	183	195	214	NA
1	LT 83	83	95	112	NA

LT = Less Than

**PACT Science Cutoff Scale Scores
For Use in Calculating Absolute Ratings**

Grade	Science				
	Below Basic 1	Below Basic 2	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
3	LT 283	283	297	313	326
4	LT 384	384	397	412	424
5	LT 482	482	497	514	524
6	LT 584	584	598	613	624
7	LT 686	686	697	714	724
8	LT 785	785	797	815	825

LT = Less Than

**PACT Social Studies Cutoff Scale Scores
For Use in Calculating Absolute Ratings**

Grade	Social Studies				
	Below Basic 1	Below Basic 2	Basic	Proficient	Advanced
3	LT 283	283	296	314	326
4	LT 382	382	394	413	425
5	LT 482	482	495	515	525
6	LT 582	582	595	614	625
7	LT 682	682	695	716	725
8	LT 785	785	795	815	825

LT = Less Than

Calculation of Absolute Ratings for Schools Enrolling Students in Grades Three through Eight

Ratings are calculated using a mathematical formula that results in an index reflecting the average performance level of students in the school. The index is calculated using the following mathematical formula:

- (1) Multiply the points assigned to each of the five PACT score categories (below) by the number of student scores falling into each of those categories for each subject area tested.

The PACT score categories and their assigned points are as follows:

Advanced:	Five points
Proficient:	Four points
Basic:	Three points
Below Basic 2:	Two points
Below Basic 1:	One point

Test scores for students who should be tested but were not are assigned a point value of zero.

- (2) Calculate an absolute index for each subject area by dividing the sum of the point scores by the number of students tested.

- (3) Multiply the absolute index calculated for each test by the appropriate weight from the table below for the year and school level (Elementary/Middle) and add totals. Note that the percentage weighting differs by year and school organizational level.

**Phase-In of PACT Science and Social Studies Weights
Elementary and Middle School Absolute Ratings**

Year	Elementary Schools (Grades 3-5)				Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)			
	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies
2004-2005	40%	40%	10%	10%	35%	35%	15%	15%
2005-2006	35%	35%	15%	15%	30%	30%	20%	20%
2006-2007 and beyond	30%	30%	20%	20%	25%	25%	25%	25%

- (4) Round the sum of the weighted indexes to the nearest tenth. This is the absolute index for assigning the Absolute Rating.

Note on rounding: Rounding is used when determining the final Absolute Rating index. Rounding was implemented to establish clear cut-off points between each rating category. The index is rounded to the tenths place. If the calculated index results in a decimal having values in the hundredths place or beyond, the value in the hundredths place is examined to determine if the value in the tenths place is to be rounded up to the next higher tenth. The value in the tenths place is rounded up if the hundredths values range from 0.05 through 0.09.

Examples:

3.34 rounds to 3.3

3.35 rounds to 3.4

3.349 rounds to 3.3

3.351 rounds to 3.4

- (5) Identify the school's Absolute Rating corresponding to the absolute index for the current year in the following table:

Index Values for Determining Absolute Ratings

Year	Range of Indexes Corresponding to Absolute Rating				
	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
2006	3.7 and above*	3.3–3.6*	2.9–3.2	2.5–2.8	Below 2.5
2007	3.8 and above*	3.4–3.7*	3.0–3.3	2.6–2.9	Below 2.6
2008	3.9 and above*	3.5–3.8*	3.1–3.4	2.7–3.0	Below 2.7
2009	4.0 and above*	3.6–3.9*	3.2–3.5	2.8–3.1	Below 2.8
2010	4.1 and above*	3.7–4.0*	3.3–3.6	2.9–3.2	Below 2.9

*School must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives for the category "all students."

- (6) Determine whether the school met the AYP goal for the category "all students."

The index (step four, above) determines the school's Absolute Rating. However, in schools with an Excellent or Good rating based on the index, the rating will be lowered one level if the school did not achieve AYP (i.e., the AYP performance and percent-tested criteria must be met) for the category "all students," calculated by using available data for the entire student body in the school for the same school year as used to calculate the Absolute Ratings. Absolute ratings will not be decreased if AYP for subgroups is not met when AYP based on "all students" has been achieved. For example, if a school had an absolute index of 3.7 in 2006 but did not achieve AYP for "all students" in 2006, its rating would be lowered from Excellent to Good. A school in 2006 with an index of 3.3 that did not achieve AYP for "all students" in 2006 would be awarded an Absolute Rating of Average rather than Good.

The EOC is committed to a phase-in of the criteria as shown in the table above. Rigor will increase annually until the ratings definitions reach the 2010 target.

Inclusion of Students with Disabilities

The inclusion of students with disabilities in the absolute performance rating is to be accomplished in the following manner:

- ❑ Students with accommodated administrations will be treated identically to students taking PACT in its standard form in absolute school and district ratings.
- ❑ Students taking alternate assessments will be included in the ratings calculation only at the district level.
- ❑ Students taking modified assessments will be factored into the Absolute Rating according to the test score earned.

Inclusion of Students with Limited English Proficiency

Students with Limited English Proficiency are tested in accordance with federal guidelines; therefore, students excused from testing by federal rules are excluded from the number of students eligible for testing.

Sample Calculation of a 2007 Absolute Rating for Elementary School Enrolling Students in Grades Three through Five

Subject Areas:

English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies

Step 1. Multiply performance level points by number of student scores for each test:

English Language arts results

Score Category	Number of Scores	x	Score Category Points	
Advanced	27	x	5	= 135
Proficient	35	x	4	= 140
Basic	110	x	3	= 330
Below Basic 2	42	x	2	= 84
Below Basic 1	17	x	1	= 17
Not Tested	5	x	0	= 0
Number of Students Tested	236*		Sum of Point Scores	= 706
* Note: Two Limited English Proficient students not tested with PACT ELA based on federal guidelines.				

Mathematics results

Score Category	Number of Scores	x	Score Category Points	
Advanced	20	x	5	= 80
Proficient	32	x	4	= 128
Basic	120	x	3	= 360
Below Basic 2	39	x	2	= 78
Below Basic 1	22	x	1	= 22
Not Tested	5	x	0	= 0
Number of Students Tested	238		Sum of Point Scores	= 668

Science results

Score Category	Number of Scores	x	Score Category Points	
Advanced	10	x	5	= 50
Proficient	25	x	4	= 100
Basic	110	x	3	= 330
Below Basic 2	52	x	2	= 104
Below Basic 1	36	x	1	= 36
Not Tested	5	x	0	= 0
Number of Students Tested	238		Sum of Point Scores	= 620

Social Studies results

Score Category	Number of Scores	x	Score Category Points	
Advanced	25	x	5	= 125
Proficient	37	x	4	= 148
Basic	112	x	3	= 336
Below Basic 2	40	x	2	= 84
Below Basic 1	19	x	1	= 19
Not Tested	5	x	0	= 0
Number of Students Tested	238		Sum of Point Scores	= 718

Step 2. Calculate an absolute index for each subject area by dividing the sum of the point scores by the number of students tested:

Test	Sum of Point Scores	÷	Number of Students Tested	Subject Area Absolute Index
English language arts	706	÷	236	= 2.9915
Mathematics	668	÷	238	= 2.8067
Science	620	÷	238	= 2.6050
Social Studies	718	÷	238	= 3.0168

Step 3. Multiply the absolute index calculated for each test by appropriate weight for year (2007) and school level (Elementary) and add totals:

Test	Subject Area Absolute Index	x	Test Weight for 2007	
English language arts	2.9915	x	.30	= 0.8974
Mathematics	2.8067	x	.30	= 0.8420
Science	2.6050	x	.20	= 0.5210
Social Studies	3.0168	x	.20	= 0.6033
			Sum of Weighted Indexes	2.8637

Step 4. Round the sum of the weighted indexes to the nearest tenth. This is the absolute index for assigning the Absolute Rating:

Sum of Weighted Indexes = 2.8637

Rounded: 2.9

Absolute Rating in 2007: Below Average

Note: This school's index of 2.9 corresponds to a Below Average Absolute Rating for the years 2007 through 2010.

Additional Step if Absolute Rating is Excellent or Good:

Did the school meet AYP for the category "all students?" Yes/No.

If the school's Absolute Rating is Excellent or Good but the school did not meet AYP for "all students," the Absolute Rating would be lowered by one level—from Excellent to Good, or from Good to Average.

Improvement Rating

The Education Accountability Act provides that the EOC may consider the performance of subgroups of students in the school in the Improvement Ratings. Improvement ratings are based on longitudinally matched student data.

Calculation of the Improvement Index

- (1) For the students who qualify for inclusion (e.g., those students for whom both current- and prior-year test scores are available and who were enrolled in the school by the forty-fifth day of the current school year), absolute indexes for the current year and for the prior year

should be computed. The absolute indexes for each year are calculated in a similar way as the absolute performance index, but the points assigned to PACT scores are selected from the following tables:

English Language Arts (ELA)
Conversion of Scale Scores to Point Weights
For Calculating Improvement Rating

Point Weight Grade	Below Basic 1				Below Basic 2				Basic				Proficient				Advanced
	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.75	2.00	2.25	2.50	2.75	3.00	3.25	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.75	5.00
8	749 or less	750	764	778	792	793	795	796	797	801	805	809	813	817	820	824	827 or more
7	649 or less	650	664	677	691	692	694	695	696	700	704	708	712	716	721	725	729 or more
6	549 or less	550	563	577	590	592	593	595	596	600	604	608	612	616	621	625	629 or more
5	448 or less	449	462	475	488	490	492	493	495	499	503	507	511	516	521	526	531 or more
4	348 or less	349	363	376	389	391	392	394	395	399	403	406	410	415	420	425	430 or more
3	249 or less	250	263	277	290	292	293	295	296	300	303	307	310	315	321	326	331 or more
2	147 or less	148	160	171	183	186	189	191	194	197	201	204	207 or more	NA	NA	NA	NA
1	46 or less	47	58	69	80	83	86	88	91	95	99	103	107 or more	NA	NA	NA	NA

Mathematics
Conversion of Scale Scores to Point Weights
For Calculating Improvement Rating

Point Weight Grade	Below Basic 1				Below Basic 2				Basic				Proficient				Advanced
	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.75	2.00	2.25	2.50	2.75	3.00	3.25	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.75	5.00
8	763 or less	764	774	783	793	795	797	798	800	805	809	814	818	820	823	825	827 or more
7	662 or less	663	672	682	691	693	696	698	700	704	709	713	717	720	722	725	727 or more
6	563 or less	564	573	582	591	593	595	597	599	604	608	613	617	620	623	625	628 or more
5	465 or less	466	474	482	490	492	495	497	499	504	508	513	517	520	523	525	528 or more
4	360 or less	361	370	380	389	392	394	397	399	403	408	412	416	419	422	424	427 or more
3	267 or less	268	275	283	290	292	294	296	298	303	307	312	316	319	321	324	326 or more
2	147 or less	148	160	171	183	186	189	192	195	200	205	209	214 or more	NA	NA	NA	NA
1	47 or less	48	60	71	83	86	89	92	95	99	104	108	112 or more	NA	NA	NA	NA

Science
Conversion of Scale Scores to Point Weights
For Calculating Improvement Rating

Point Weight Grade	Below Basic 1				Below Basic 2				Basic				Proficient				Advanced
	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.75	2.00	2.25	2.50	2.75	3.00	3.25	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.75	5.00
8	747 or less	748	760	773	785	788	791	794	797	801	806	811	815	817	820	822	825 or more
7	647 or less	648	661	674	686	688	691	694	697	701	706	710	714	716	719	721	724 or more
6	547 or less	548	560	572	584	587	591	593	598	601	605	609	613	615	618	621	624 or more
5	447 or less	448	459	471	482	485	489	493	497	501	506	510	514	516	519	521	524 or more
4	347 or less	348	360	372	384	387	391	394	397	400	404	408	412	415	418	421	424 or more
3	247 or less	248	260	272	283	286	290	293	297	301	305	309	313	316	320	323	326 or more

Social Studies
Conversion of Scale Scores to Point Weights
For Calculating Improvement Rating

Point Weight Grade	Below Basic 1				Below Basic 2				Basic				Proficient				Advanced
	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.75	2.00	2.25	2.50	2.75	3.00	3.25	3.50	3.75	4.00	4.25	4.50	4.75	5.00
8	747 or less	748	760	773	785	787	790	793	795	800	805	810	815	817	820	822	825 or more
7	647 or less	648	659	671	682	685	689	692	695	700	706	711	716	718	721	723	725 or more
6	547 or less	548	559	571	582	585	589	592	595	599	604	609	614	616	619	622	625 or more
5	447 or less	448	459	471	482	485	489	492	495	500	505	510	515	517	520	522	525 or more
4	347 or less	348	359	371	382	385	388	391	394	398	403	408	413	416	419	422	425 or more
3	248 or less	249	260	272	283	286	290	293	296	300	305	309	314	317	320	323	326 or more

The appropriate point weight corresponding to each student's ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies PACT score is determined from the tables on pages 23-26, and the point weights are summed and averaged as in the calculation of the absolute index. These calculations are carried out for matched longitudinal data for both the current and prior year. As with the Absolute Ratings, the subject areas received different weightings in elementary and middle schools beginning in 2005, but the weightings are not phased in over time. The following table lists the subject area weights used for calculating the Improvement Rating index for elementary (grades 3-5) and middle (grades 6-8) schools.

**PACT ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies Weights
Elementary and Middle School Improvement Ratings**

Year	Elementary Schools (Grades 3-5)				Middle Schools (Grades 6-8)			
	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies
2004-2005 and beyond	30%	30%	20%	20%	25%	25%	25%	25%

- (2) Subtract the index based on the longitudinally matched data for the prior year from the longitudinal index for the current year and round the difference to the nearest tenth. This difference is the improvement index. For example, if the current year index is 3.58 and the prior year's index was 3.24, the improvement index is 0.34, which rounds to 0.3. An important point to note is that the absolute performance index calculated to determine the absolute performance rating for a given year and the absolute index for calculating the improvement index for the same year may differ because of differences in the 45-day enrollments, the loss of student data that could not be longitudinally matched in the calculation of the improvement index, the use of tables containing different values for converting test scores to point weights, and the use of different weightings for the subject areas when calculating the absolute and improvement indexes.
- (3) Compare the school's improvement index to those in the table below to determine the school's Improvement Rating. For example, the school achieving an improvement index of 0.3 would receive an Improvement Rating of Good.

Improvement Performance Rating Criteria

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	0.4 or greater
Good	0.3
Average	0.1–0.2
Below Average	0.0
Unsatisfactory	-0.1 or less

- (4) A school's Improvement Rating may be increased by one level if the improvement in performance of historically underachieving students meets or exceeds a criterion. Historically underachieving groups consist of African-American, Hispanic, and Native American students, those eligible for the free or reduced-price federal lunch program, Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, migrant students, and students with non-speech disabilities. The school's eligibility for the increased Improvement Rating is determined as follows:

- a. Calculate the improvement index for the group of eligible students. The group must consist of 40 or more students to be considered for analysis.
- b. Compare the improvement index for the group to the state two-year average improvement index for all students in the state. The state two-year average improvement index is the average of the improvement indexes for all students for the current and prior years. If the improvement index for the historically underachieving group in the school exceeds the state two-year average improvement index by at least one standard deviation, the school's Improvement Rating may be increased by one level. If the school is rated Excellent for improvement on the basis of all students, the performance for groups should also be calculated and reported even though the school's rating cannot be increased.

Sample Calculation of an Improvement Rating for Schools Enrolling Students in Grades Three through Eight

Index for current school year:	3.34
Index for prior school year:	<u>-3.62</u>
Difference:	-0.32
Round to:	-0.3
Improvement Rating:	Unsatisfactory

Schools Having Grade Three as the Highest Grade Enrolled

Longitudinal analyses of scores from students enrolled in schools having grade organizations such as kindergarten through grade three, grades two through three, grades one through three, and so on, cannot be performed because these schools will have PACT data for grade three only. There is no PACT test in grade two administered on a statewide basis to serve as a pretest for the longitudinally matched data. The Improvement Rating for schools such as these will be calculated based on the change in absolute performance from year to year. The change in absolute performance is calculated by subtracting the un-rounded absolute index for the previous year from the un-rounded absolute index for the current year. The result is then rounded to the nearest tenth of a point.

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Subsequent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

Ratings for High Schools

Beginning with the 2006-2007 school year the Absolute and Improvement ratings for high schools are calculated on a weighted model using the following criteria: longitudinal High School Assessment Program (HSAP) performance, the percentage of end-of-course tests administered at the school having scores of 70 or above, performance on HSAP of students at the school taking the test for the first time, and four-year graduation rate. (Note: The report and

recommendations regarding the use of end-of-course results for calculating high school ratings is in Appendix B-3.)

Two ratings are to be assigned to schools. The ratings for absolute performance and improvement performance are defined in article 1 of the Education Accountability Act of 1998, Section 59-18-120:

“Absolute performance” means the rating a school will receive based on the percentage of students meeting standard on the state’s standards based assessment;

“Improvement performance” means the rating a school will receive based on longitudinally matched student data comparing current performance to the previous year’s performance for the purpose of determining student academic growth.

As required by the United States Department of Education through passage of the No Child Left Behind legislation, a notice of each school’s attainment of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) must be reported. AYP specifies statewide targets for percent tested and achievement to be met by all students and by specific demographic groups. Information on the determination of AYP is available from the South Carolina Department of Education (www.myschools.com).

Ratings Criteria

- ❑ Longitudinal High School Assessment Program (HSAP) performance: This factor gauges the percentage of students who pass the HSAP by the spring graduation two years after taking the examination for the first time. Students transferring to other schools should be deleted from the calculation; however students dropping out are included. Longitudinal HSAP performance is the percentage of students who score a “2” level or higher on both ELA and Math within two years after taking it for the first time.
- ❑ First-attempt HSAP performance: The percentage of students taking the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) for the first time who passed both the English language arts and mathematics subtests by scoring at the performance level of “2” or higher.
- ❑ Percentage passing end-of-course tests: The percent of passing scores (70 or higher) on all of the end-of-course tests administered in the high school during the school year and subsequent summer session. Beginning with the 2006–2007 school year, the end-of-course assessments will include Algebra I, English I, Biology I, and Physical Science; U.S. History and Constitution will be added in 2007-2008.
- ❑ Four-year Graduation rate: The percentage of all students (including students with disabilities) enrolled for the first time in grade nine four years prior to the year of the report card who earn a standard high school diploma (not GED), adjusted for transfers in and out of the school. Adjustments for students transferring out of the school or district cannot be made for those students for whom there is not evidence of enrollment in another state diploma granting program (for example, requests for transcripts from another state diploma granting program, placement in the juvenile or criminal justice system, etc.). Include data from students who meet the state diploma requirements as a result of attending summer school and/or successfully passing HSAP in the summer following their senior year in the calculation of the four-year graduation rate; this should take effect as soon as the State Department of Education and school districts can arrange for timely receipt of the data needed.

Note Regarding Four-year Graduation Rate Criterion: The precision and accuracy of the four-year graduation rate calculated for the school and district report cards is currently limited by the lack of accurate identifiers to track the progress of students. Based on a study of the progress of two cohorts of students (those who were ninth graders in 1999-2000 and those who were ninth graders in 2000-2001) in six South Carolina schools, on studies of enrollments of cohorts of students from eighth grade through grade twelve, and on information provided by high school principals, the assumption that students who leave the state's high schools before graduation are transferring to another school is erroneous in many cases (for a discussion of this issue at the national level, see *What Counts: Defining and Improving High School Graduation Rates*, available from the National Association of Secondary School Principals at http://www.principals.org/s_nassp/sec.asp?CID=29&DID=50356.) To improve the accuracy of the identification of legitimate transfers and to more accurately discriminate them from school dropouts a project to assign unique student identification numbers to all South Carolina public school students was implemented in Fall 2005. It is expected that the phase-in of the student identifier system will allow accurate tracking of ninth and tenth grade students in 2006-2007, ninth, tenth, and eleventh graders in 2007-2008, and ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth graders by 2008-2009. However, until more accurate measures of high school graduation rate are available in 2009, the following statement will accompany all references to the high school graduation rate reported on school and district report cards:

“NOTE: Graduation rates published on the S.C. school and district report cards may be higher than the actual rates because of incomplete data on students who are no longer enrolled in the school or district.”

Calculation of Absolute Rating

Ratings are calculated using a mathematical formula that results in an index. The following point distribution is applied to each of the criteria for the calculation of the absolute index (the percentage weighting for each criterion is applied to the calculation of the index):

Criteria for High School Ratings Beginning in 2006-2007

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
Longitudinal Exit Exam Passage Rate (30%)	100%	97.5–99.9%	90.7–97.4%	87.3–90.6%	Below 87.3%
First-attempt HSAP Passage Rate (20%)	62.9% or more	53.7–62.8%	37.4–53.6%	26.7–37.3%	Below 26.7%
% Scoring 70 or Above on End-of-Course Tests (20%)	87.8% or more	72.4–87.7%	41.6–72.3%	26.2–41.5%	Below 26.2%
Graduation Rate (30%)	88.3% or more	79.6–88.2%	62.2–79.5%	53.5–62.1%	Below 53.5%

The index is calculated using the following formula:

- (1) Match the school's data/performance to the points assigned to each rating criterion in the table above.
- (2) Add the weighted points for each criterion. Weighted points are calculated by multiplying the assigned points by the weighting factor assigned to each criterion.

The resulting index determines the school's Absolute Rating as follows:

Index Values for Determining Absolute Ratings

Year	Range of Indexes Corresponding to Absolute Rating				
	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
2006	3.7 and above*	3.3–3.6*	2.9–3.2	2.5–2.8	Below 2.5
2007	3.8 and above*	3.4–3.7*	3.0–3.3	2.6–2.9	Below 2.6
2008	3.9 and above*	3.5–3.8*	3.1–3.4	2.7–3.0	Below 2.7
2009	4.0 and above*	3.6–3.9*	3.2–3.5	2.8–3.1	Below 2.8
2010	4.1 and above*	3.7–4.0*	3.3–3.6	2.9–3.2	Below 2.9

*School must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives for the category "all students."

The index determines the school's Absolute Rating. However, beginning in 2005 in schools with an Excellent or Good rating based on the index, the rating is lowered one level if the school did not meet AYP (i.e., the AYP performance and percent-tested criteria must be met) for the category "all students," calculated by using available data for the entire student body in the school for the same school year as used to calculate the Absolute Ratings. Absolute ratings will not be decreased if AYP for subgroups is not met when AYP based on "all students" has been achieved. For example, if a school had an absolute index of 3.7 in 2006 but did not achieve AYP for "all students," its rating would be lowered from Excellent to Good. A school in 2006 with an index of 3.3 that did not achieve AYP for "all students" would be awarded an Absolute Rating of Average rather than Good.

Sample Calculation of an Absolute Rating for a High School

92% Longitudinal Exit Exam:	(3 X 0.3) = 0.9 points
64% Tenth-grade passage rate:	(5 X 0.2) = 1.0 points
71% Passing end-of-course tests:	(3 X 0.2) = 0.6 points
70% Graduation Rate:	(3 X 0.3) = <u>0.9 points</u>
	3.4 Index
Sum =	
Absolute Rating:	Good

Note: In 2007 an index of 3.4 corresponds to a Good Absolute Rating, and from 2008 through 2010 it becomes Average.

Additional Step if Absolute Rating is Excellent or Good:

Did the school meet AYP for the category "all students?" Yes/No.

If the school's Absolute Rating is Excellent or Good but the school did not meet AYP for the category "all students," the Absolute Rating would be lowered by one level—from Excellent to Good or from Good to Average.

Students who should be tested but are not tested will be assigned a weight of zero in the accountability ratings.

Inclusion of Students with Disabilities

The inclusion of students with disabilities in the absolute performance rating is to be accomplished in the following manner:

- ❑ Students with accommodated administrations will be treated identically to students taking the HSAP in its standard form in absolute school and district ratings.
- ❑ Students taking modified assessments will be factored into the Absolute Rating according to the test score earned.
- ❑ Students taking alternate assessments will be included in the ratings calculation only at the district level.

Inclusion of Students with Limited English Proficiency

Students with Limited English Proficiency are only tested in accordance with federal guidelines; therefore, students excused from testing by federal rules are excluded from the number of students eligible for testing.

Improvement Performance Rating

Note: Longitudinal student-matched data are unavailable at the high school level because of the structure of the curriculum and assessments. Therefore, the methodology examines improvement of cohorts of students over time.

The Improvement Ratings are calculated using a mathematical formula that results in an index. The index is calculated by subtracting the school's Absolute Rating index from the prior year from the school's current year's Absolute Rating index. (Note: The 2006-2007 high school Improvement rating will be calculated based on the 2007 Absolute rating index and the recalculated 2006 Absolute index recalculated by substituting end-of-course performance for LIFE Scholarship eligibility.) The difference determines the rating as follows:

High School Improvement Performance Rating Criteria

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	0.4 or greater
Good	0.3
Average	0.1–0.2
Below Average	0.0
Unsatisfactory	-0.1 or less

Sample Calculation of an Improvement Rating for a High School

Absolute rating index for school year for which report card is based:	2.44
Absolute rating index for the prior school year:	<u>-2.22</u>
Difference:	0.22
Rounds to:	0.2

Improvement Rating: Average

A school's Improvement Rating may be increased by one level if the improvement in performance of historically underachieving students meets or exceeds a criterion. Historically underachieving groups consist of African-American, Hispanic, and Native American students, Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, migrant students, those eligible for the free or reduced-price federal lunch program, and students with non-speech disabilities. The school's eligibility for the increased Improvement Rating is determined as follows:

- (1) Calculate the improvement index for the group of eligible students. The group must consist of 40 or more students to be considered for analysis.
- (2) Compare the improvement index for the group to the state two-year average improvement index for all students in the state. The state two-year average improvement index is the average of the improvement indexes for all students for the current and prior years. If the improvement index for the historically underachieving group in the school exceeds the state two-year average improvement index by at least one standard deviation, the school's Improvement Rating may be increased by one level. If the school is rated Excellent for improvement on the basis of all students, the performance for groups should also be calculated and reported even though the school's rating cannot be increased.

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Subsequent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

Ratings for Career and Technology Centers

Two ratings are to be assigned to schools. The ratings for absolute performance and improvement performance are defined in article 1 of the Education Accountability Act of 1998, Section 59-18-120:

"Absolute performance" means the rating a school will receive based on the percentage of students meeting standard on the state's standards based assessment;

"Improvement performance" means the rating a school will receive based on longitudinally matched student data comparing current performance to their previous year's performance for the purpose of determining student academic growth.

As required by the United States Department of Education through passage of the No Child Left Behind legislation, a notice of each school's attainment of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) must be reported. AYP specifies statewide targets for percent tested and achievement to be met by all students and by specific demographic groups. Information on the determination of AYP is available from the South Carolina Department of Education (www.myschools.com).

State ratings criteria and definitions were developed through work with a group of career and technology center directors and with advice from the School-to-Work Advisory Council. Four criteria for use in the ratings are adopted as shown below. These criteria incorporate the requirements of the statute, as further detailed in the proviso.

The results from the ratings reported on the 2001 report card were reviewed with career and technology center principals and representatives from the State Department of Education. The 2001 ratings did not successfully differentiate levels of quality among centers (95 percent were rated Excellent, 2.5 percent were rated Good, and 2.5 percent were rated Average). The results from a review of the criteria by State Department of Education personnel indicate that the enrollment criterion in the rating did not reflect program quality but rather was affected by factors not under direct control of career and technology center personnel. For example, the percentage enrollment was dependent in some cases on the distance and time needed for students to travel between a center and its feeder high schools. These factors did not allow for improvement in enrollment in all cases.

At its March 21, 2002, meeting, the EOC adopted the following criteria:

- ❑ Mastering core competencies or certification requirements: The percentage of students enrolled in career and technology courses at the center who earn a 2.0 or above on the final course grade. Students are to be assessed on the competencies identified in the adopted syllabi or specified for certification programs (e.g., FAMS). This factor applies to any career and technology course in the center. This criterion is weighted at twice the value of other criteria.
- ❑ Graduation rate: The number of twelfth-grade career technology education students who graduate in the spring is divided by the number of twelfth graders enrolled in the center and converted to a percentage. This criterion incorporates passage of the Exit Examination required for graduation.
- ❑ Placement rate: The number of career and technology completers who are available for placement in postsecondary instruction, military services, or employment is divided into the number of students over a three-year period who are actually placed and converted to a percentage. This criterion mirrors the Perkins standard.

The criteria should be weighted as follows:

- ❑ Mastering core competencies or certification requirements should be weighted 50 percent in the calculation of the rating.
- ❑ Graduation rate should be weighted 25 percent.
- ❑ Placement rate should be weighted 25 percent.

These criteria are currently under review by the Career and Technology Center Ratings Advisory Committee for possible implementation of revisions in 2007-2008.

Absolute Rating Calculation

Ratings are calculated using a mathematical formula based on the point weightings in the table below, which results in an index.

Career and Technology Center Absolute Ratings Criteria

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
Mastery (weighted x 5)	86% or more	78–85%	70–77%	62–69%	61% or below
Graduation (weighted x 2.5)	97% or more	92–96%	87–91%	82–86%	81% or below
Placement (weighted x 2.5)	98% or more	95–97%	92–94%	89–91%	88% or below

The absolute index is calculated using the following formula:

(1) Match the center's data/performance to the points assigned to each rating criterion (table above).

(2) Add the weighted points for each criterion. Weighted points are calculated by multiplying the assigned points by the weighting factor assigned to each criterion. Weighting factors are:

Mastery = 5.0

Graduation = 2.5

Placement = 2.5

Total Weight = 10

(3) Add the points and divide the total by ten (the total of criteria weighting factors).

The resulting index determines the school's Absolute Rating as follows:

Career and Technology Center Absolute Performance Rating

Year	Range of Indexes Corresponding to Absolute Rating				
	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
2006	3.7 and above	3.3–3.6	2.9–3.2	2.5–2.8	Below 2.5
2007	3.8 and above	3.4–3.7	3.0–3.3	2.6–2.9	Below 2.6
2008	3.9 and above	3.5–3.8	3.1–3.4	2.7–3.0	Below 2.7
2009	4.0 and above	3.6–3.9	3.2–3.5	2.8–3.1	Below 2.8
2010	4.1 and above	3.7–4.0	3.3–3.6	2.9–3.2	Below 2.9

The index determines the school's Absolute Rating. Only those career and technology centers receiving Absolute Ratings of Unsatisfactory will fail to meet AYP for *all* students.

Sample Calculation of an Absolute Rating for a Career and Technology Center

78% of students exhibiting mastery:	(4 X 5) =20.0 points
97% of Twelfth grader graduating:	(5 X 2.5) =12.5 points
73% placement rate:	(1 X 2.5) = <u>+2.5 points</u>
Total points:	35 points
Divided by 10:	<u>÷10</u> (total of weights)
Absolute Index:	3.5 Index
Absolute Rating:	Excellent

Note: A 3.5 index corresponds to a Good Absolute Rating in 2005, Average in 2009, and Below Average in 2013.

Improvement Rating

Note: Longitudinal student-matched data are unavailable for career and technology centers because of the structure of the curriculum and the criteria used in the ratings. Therefore, the methodology examines improvement of cohorts of students over time.

School indexes are compared using student cohort data. The absolute index of scores from year one is to be computed and compared to the absolute index from year two. The difference between the two indexes will be computed. For example, if the year two index is 3.54 and the year one index was 3.20, the difference would be .34, which rounds to 0.3. The amount of change (difference from one year to the next) determines the rating as follows:

Career and Technology Center Improvement Performance Rating

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	0.4 or greater
Good	0.3
Average	0.1–0.2
Below Average	0.0
Unsatisfactory	-0.1 or less

Sample Calculation of an Improvement Rating for a Career and Technology Center

Absolute rating index for school year for which report card is based:	2.44
Absolute rating index for the prior school year:	<u>-2.22</u>
Difference:	0.22
Rounds to:	0.2
Improvement Rating:	Average

A school's Improvement Rating may be increased by one level if the improvement in performance of historically underachieving students meets or exceeds a criterion. Historically underachieving groups consist of African-American, Hispanic, and Native American students, Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, migrant students, those eligible for the free or reduced-price federal lunch program and students with non-speech disabilities. The school's eligibility for the increased Improvement Rating is determined as follows:

- (1) Calculate the improvement index for the group of eligible students. The group must consist of forty or more students to be considered for analysis.
- (2) Compare the improvement index for the group to the state two-year average improvement index for all students in the state. The state two-year average improvement index is the average of the improvement indexes for all students for the current and prior years. If the improvement index for the historically underachieving group in the school exceeds the state two-year average improvement index by at least one standard deviation, the school's Improvement Rating may be increased by one level. If the school is rated Excellent for improvement on the basis of all students, the performance for groups should also be calculated and reported even though the school's rating cannot be increased.

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Adjacent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

Ratings for School Districts

Two ratings are to be assigned to school districts. The ratings for absolute performance and improvement performance are defined in Article 1 of the Education Accountability Act of 1998, Section 59-18-120:

"Absolute performance" means the rating a district will receive based on the percentage of students meeting standard on the state's standards based assessment;

"Improvement performance" means the rating a district will receive based on longitudinally matched student data comparing current performance to the previous year's performance for the purpose of determining student academic growth.

As required by the United States Department of Education through its implementation of the No Child Left Behind legislation, a notice of each district's attainment of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) must be reported. AYP specifies statewide targets for percent tested and achievement to be met by all students and by specific demographic groups. Information on the determination of AYP is available from the South Carolina Department of Education (www.myschools.com).

In April 2005 the EOC removed the LIFE Scholarship eligibility criterion from the high school component of the district ratings and replaced it with the end-of-course test results, to begin with the 2005-2006 school year. In addition, Proviso 1A.59 to the 2006-2007 Appropriation Act provides for the inclusion of "graduation from high school with a state high school diploma" as a component of the district ratings.

Absolute and Improvement Ratings of school districts are calculated based on the school ratings methodology for grades three through eight and on a weighting methodology for the high school level data similar to that used for high schools. Student assessment data included in the calculation of the indexes include data from students enrolled in the district as of the forty-fifth day of instruction; high school graduation rate data are based on data from students enrolled for the first time in ninth grade four years prior to the year for which the ratings are calculated. A

cumulative index based on the data from the elementary, middle, and high school levels is defined and the index is evaluated as described below.

Criteria for District Ratings Beginning with School Year 2005-2006

The district rating index is calculated using the following procedures:

- (1) Identify the students whose data are to be used in the school district Absolute Ratings calculations based on the following table. (Note: the Education Accountability Act was amended in 2006 (Section 59-18-920) to direct that data from students attending a charter school authorized by a local school district are not to be included in the calculation of the local school district ratings. Ratings for charter schools authorized by a local school district are to be reported separately on the school district report card.)

Students Whose Data Are Used to Calculate District Absolute Ratings

Rating Measure	Students
PACT & PACT-Alt, Grades 3-8	Enrolled in district by 45 th day and on first day of testing of year for which Absolute Rating is calculated.
HSAP First Attempt	Enrolled in district during school year for which Absolute Rating is calculated; this includes students enrolled in junior high schools or other school organizations which include grade 9 and in which students are tested with HSAP in addition to students enrolled in high school. Also includes students tested with HSAP-Alternate assessment.
Four-Year Graduation Rate	Enrolled in grade 9 first time four years prior to year graduation rate calculated (e.g., expected senior year) (includes data from summer following current school year.)
End-of-Course Test Results	Enrolled in district during school year for which Absolute Rating is calculated (includes data from summer following current school year.)

- (2) Calculate an index using PACT performance and PACT Alternate Assessment performance of district students in grades three through eight using the same mathematical formula for calculating an Absolute Rating for schools enrolling students in grades three through eight. Students who should be tested but are not tested will be assigned a weight of zero in the accountability ratings.

Note: Since the performance rating categories Below Basic I and Below Basic II are not available from the PACT-Alt results, the following weights for the calculation of absolute and improvement indexes should be used:

Weights for Calculation of Indexes Using PACT-Alt Data Only

PACT-Alt Score	Point Weight
Below Basic	1.5
Basic	3
Proficient	4
Advanced	5

- (3) Assign points to criteria for district high school student performance based on the criteria in the table below.

High School Components of School District Ratings for 2005-2006 and Beyond

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
First-attempt HSAP Passage Rate	92.9% or more	83.1–92.8%	63.7–83.0%	53.9–63.6%	Below 53.9%
End-of-Course Test Results	77.2% or more	65.6–77.1%	42.4–65.5%	30.8–42.3%	Below 30.8%
4- year Graduation Rate	93.6% or more	85.2–93.5%	68.2–85.1%	59.7–68.1%	Below 59.7%

- (4) Calculate the district index points for each component based on the data weights listed in the table below.

Weights for Components of District Ratings

District Rating Component	Weight for Calculating Rating
Elementary and Middle School Component	
PACT Assessments, Grades 3-8	60%
High School Components:	
Four-year Graduation Rate	30%
HSAP First Attempt Passage Rate	5%
End-of-Course Test Results	5%
Total	100%

- (5) Sum the weighted index points awarded to each component in the district index. Round the resulting sum to the nearest tenth; this is the district rating index.

The resulting index determines the school district's Absolute Rating as follows:

District Absolute Rating

Year	Range of Indexes Corresponding to Absolute Rating				
	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
2006	3.7 and above*	3.3–3.6*	2.9–3.2	2.5–2.8	Below 2.5
2007	3.8 and above*	3.4–3.7*	3.0–3.3	2.6–2.9	Below 2.6
2008	3.9 and above*	3.5–3.8*	3.1–3.4	2.7–3.0	Below 2.7
2009	4.0 and above*	3.6–3.9*	3.2–3.5	2.8–3.1	Below 2.8
2010	4.1 and above*	3.7–4.0*	3.3–3.6	2.9–3.2	Below 2.9

*District must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives for the category "all students."

The index determines the district's Absolute Rating. However, in districts with an Excellent or Good rating based on the index, the rating will be lowered one level if the district did not meet AYP (i.e., the AYP performance and percent-tested criteria must be met) for the category "all students," calculated by using available data for the entire student body in the district for the same school year as used to calculate the Absolute Ratings. Absolute ratings will not be

decreased if AYP for subgroups is not met when AYP based on “all students” has been achieved. For example, if a district had an absolute index of 3.7 in 2006 but did not achieve AYP for “all students,” its rating would be lowered from Excellent to Good. A district in 2006 with an index of 3.4 that did not achieve AYP for “all students” would be awarded an Absolute Rating of Average rather than Good.

Sample Calculation of an Absolute Rating for a School District

School Level	Measure	Performance Level	Points Assigned	Weight	Weighted Index Points
Elementary/Middle	PACT Grades 3-8	2.92	2.92	X 0.60	= 1.752
High School	HSAP 1 st Attempt	79.4%	3	X 0.05	= 0.150
	End-of-Course Tests	70.2%	4	X 0.05	= 0.200
	4-year Graduation Rate	81.3%	3	X 0.30	= 0.900
District Index					3.002

District index rounded to nearest tenth: 3.0
Absolute Rating: Average

Note: This school district’s index of 3.0 corresponds to an Average Absolute Rating in 2007. From 2008 through 2010, an index of 3.0 is Below Average.

Additional Step if Absolute Rating is Excellent or Good:

Did the district meet AYP for the category “all students?” Yes/No.

If the district’s Absolute Rating is Excellent or Good but the district did not meet AYP for “all students,” the Absolute Rating would be lowered by one level—from Excellent to Good or from Good to Average.

Inclusion of Students with Disabilities

Inclusion of students with disabilities in the absolute performance rating is to be accomplished in the following manner:

- ☐ Students with accommodated administrations will be treated identically to students taking other assessments in their standard form in absolute school and district ratings.
- ☐ Students taking alternate assessments will be included in the calculation of the ratings only at the district level.
- ☐ Students taking modified assessments will be factored into the Absolute and Improvement Ratings according to the test score earned.

Inclusion of Students with Limited English Proficiency

Students with Limited English Proficiency are tested in accordance with federal guidelines; therefore, students excused from testing by federal rules are excluded from the number of students eligible for testing.

Improvement Rating

The Education Accountability Act provides that the EOC may consider the performance of subgroups of students in the Improvement Ratings. Improvement Ratings are based on longitudinally matched student data, where available.

Calculation of the Improvement Index

- (1) Identify the students whose data are to be used in the school district Improvement Ratings calculations based on the following table. (Note: data from students attending charter schools authorized by the local school district are not to be used for calculating the local school district Improvement rating.)

Students Whose Data Are Used to Calculate District Improvement Ratings Beginning With 2005-2006 School Year

Rating Measure	Students
PACT & PACT-Alt, Grades 3-8	Students enrolled in district by 45 th day of year for which Improvement Rating is calculated and students enrolled by 45 th day of previous school year
HSAP First Attempt	Students enrolled in district during school year for which Improvement Rating is calculated and students enrolled during previous school year. Includes students enrolled in junior high schools or other school organizations which include grade 9 and in which students are tested with HSAP in addition to students enrolled in high school; also includes students tested with HSAP-Alternate assessment.
Four-Year Graduation Rate	Students enrolled in grade nine for first time four years prior to year graduation rate calculated (e.g., expected senior year) and students enrolled in grade nine five years prior to year graduation rate calculated (includes data from summer following current school year)
End-of-Course Test Results	Students enrolled in district during school year for which Improvement Rating is calculated and students enrolled in district during previous school year; includes data from summer following current school year.

- (2) For the students who qualify for inclusion, calculate an index for the current year and for the prior year. The indexes for each year should be calculated in the same way as the absolute performance index. The PACT data component of the indexes for computing the Improvement Rating should be based on matched longitudinal data using the point weights for performance listed in the tables for calculating improvement ratings for schools enrolling grades three through eight.
- (3) Subtract the district index for the prior year from the district index for the current year and round the result to the nearest tenth. This difference is the improvement index. For

example, if the current year district index is 3.54 and the prior year's district index was 3.23, the rounded improvement index is 0.3. An important point to note is that the absolute performance index calculated to determine the absolute performance rating for a given year and the index for calculating the improvement index for the same year may differ because of differences in the 45-day enrollments, the loss of student data that could not be longitudinally matched, the use of tables containing different values for converting PACT test scores to point weights, and the use of different weightings for the PACT subject areas when calculating the absolute and improvement indexes.

- (4) Compare the district's improvement index to those in the table below to determine the district's Improvement Rating. For example, the district achieving an improvement index of 0.3 would receive an Improvement Rating of Good.

Improvement Performance Rating Criteria

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	0.4 or greater
Good	0.3
Average	0.1–0.2
Below Average	0.0
Unsatisfactory	-0.1 or less

- (5) A district's Improvement Rating may be increased by one level if the improvement in performance of historically underachieving students meets or exceeds a criterion. Historically underachieving groups consist of African-American, Hispanic, and Native American students, Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, migrant students, those eligible for the free or reduced-price federal lunch program, and students with non-speech disabilities. The district's eligibility for the increased Improvement Rating is determined as follows:
 - a. Calculate the improvement index for the group of eligible students. The group must consist of 40 or more students to be considered for analysis.
 - b. Compare the improvement index for the group to the state two-year average improvement index for all students in the state. The state two-year average improvement index is the average of the improvement indexes for all students for the current and prior years. If the improvement index for the historically underachieving group in the district exceeds the state two-year average improvement index by at least one standard deviation, the district's Improvement Rating may be increased by one level. If the district is rated Excellent for improvement on the basis of all students, the performance for groups should also be calculated and reported even though the district's rating cannot be increased.

Districts with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Subsequent Years

If a district is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the district will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the district's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the district's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these districts. Districts achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

Ratings for Special Schools

THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS: PALMETTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Students to Be Included in the Rating

High school eligible students who have participated in the educational program for a minimum of one hundred days during the fiscal year are to be included. All Palmetto Unified programs are to be reported as one school.

Criteria for the Rating

- ❑ GED completion rate: This is calculated by the number of successful completers divided by the number of students enrolled in the GED program. Those who completed the GED prior to one hundred days are to be included in the calculation;
- ❑ Career and technology program completers: This is calculated by the number of program completers (federal definition) divided by the number of students enrolled in the career and technology program; and
- ❑ Pretest and posttest gains on the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE): This average gain from the pretest to the posttest is calculated by adding the gains of individual students and dividing by the total number of students.

Calculation of the Absolute Performance Rating

Assign points (one through five) for each criterion in the following manner:

Absolute Performance Ratings Criteria

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
GED Completion %	81–100	61–80	41–60	20–40	19 or less
Career and Technology Completers %	81–100	61–80	41–60	20–40	19 or less
Pretest-Posttest TABE Gains	0.80 or more	0.60–0.79	0.40–0.59	0.20–0.39	Less than 0.20

Add the points and divide by three to yield an index. The index determines the school's Absolute Rating.

Absolute Performance Level Ratings

Rating	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 Target
Excellent	3.5 or higher	3.6 or higher	3.7 or higher	3.8 or higher	3.9 or higher	4.0 or more
Good	3.2-3.4	3.3-3.5	3.4-3.6	3.5-3.7	3.6-3.8	3.6-3.9
Average	2.9-3.1	3.0-3.2	3.1-3.5	3.2-3.6	3.3-3.7	3.3-3.5
Below Average	2.7-2.8	2.8-2.9	2.9-3.0	3.0-3.2	3.1-3.3	3.0-3.2
Unsatisfactory	Less than 2.7	Less than 2.8	Less than 2.9	Less than 3.0	Less than 3.1	Less than 3.0

Improvement Rating

Using the absolute performance indexes, calculate annual gains based on current year minus previous year.

Palmetto Unified Improvement Ratings

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	Gains of .3 or above
Good	Gains of .2 to .29
Average	Gains of .1 to .19
Below Average	Gains of .01 to .09
Unsatisfactory	No gain or a loss

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Adjacent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

Students Included in the Rating

GED: Students who are age 16 and earn a passing score on the Pre-GED are designated "eligible" to take the GED. Seventeen and eighteen year old students who register to take the GED are also considered eligible. These students are not required to take the Pre-GED.

High School Credits Earned: High school students who earn Carnegie units during the school year,

STAR Gains: Middle school students who are assessed in reading and math using the STAR program. Students who have attended middle school for at least 90 school days will be included in the assessment.

Middle School Classes Passed: Middle school students who complete the four content area courses during the school year.

Calculations will be based on the DJJ School District calendar year. (August 1st through July 31st)

Criteria for the Rating

GED: The percentage of students who pass the GED will be calculated by dividing the number of students who passed the GED by the total taking the test during the school year.

High School Credits: The average high school credits earned will be calculated by dividing the total number of Carnegie units earned by the number of students who completed the courses.

STAR Gains: Pre-post test scores will be calculated for reading and math. The percentage of students who make gains will be calculated by dividing the number of students who made gains by the total number of students tested.

Middle School Classes Passed: The average for the four main content area classes passed will be calculated by dividing total classes passed by the number of the students who completed the courses (science, social studies, lang. arts, math).

Calculation of the Index

Note: Each criterion is weighted as indicated in parentheses

Criterion	5	4	3	2	1
GED Completion Rate (.25)	50% +	45-49%	40-44%	35-39%	Below 35%
HS Credits Earned (.5)	5+	4+	3+	2+	less than 2 credits
STAR Gains/ Reading (.05)	75%+	60-74%	45-59%	30-44%	Below 30%
STAR Gains/Math (.05)	75%+	60-74%	45-59%	30-44%	Below 30%
Middle School Classes Passed (.15)	4	3	2	1	No credits earned (SC./Math/Eng/SS)

Absolute Performance Level Ratings

Rating	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 Target
Excellent	3.5 or higher	3.6 or higher	3.7 or higher	3.8 or higher	3.9 or higher	4.0 or more
Good	3.2-3.4	3.3-3.5	3.4-3.6	3.5-3.7	3.6-3.8	3.6-3.9
Average	2.9-3.1	3.0-3.2	3.1-3.5	3.2-3.6	3.3-3.7	3.3-3.5
Below Average	2.7-2.8	2.8-2.9	2.9-3.0	3.0-3.2	3.1-3.3	3.0-3.2
Unsatisfactory	Less than 2.7	Less than 2.8	Less than 2.9	Less than 3.0	Less than 3.1	Less than 3.0

Improvement Rating

Using the absolute performance indexes, calculate annual gains based on current year minus previous year.

Department of Juvenile Justice Improvement Ratings

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	Gains of .3 or above
Good	Gains of .2 to .29
Average	Gains of .1 to .19
Below Average	Gains of .01 to .09
Unsatisfactory	No gain or a loss

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Adjacent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF AND THE BLIND

Students to Be Included in the Rating

Students who are enrolled in the school as of the forty-fifth day of instruction and remain through the spring testing period are included in the rating.

Criteria for the Rating

- ❑ Mastery of Individualized Education Plan objectives: Mastery is documented through categorical scores in English language arts and math assessments (reported as Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic).
- ❑ PACT Alternate Assessment: Student scores are reported on the state-adopted scale of Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic.
- ❑ Brigance Performance: Gains per year on the developmental scale are converted to categories of Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic.

Calculation of the Index

Absolute Ratings Criteria for the S.C. School for the Deaf and the Blind

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
% Mastery of IEP objectives	90–100	76–89	60–75	50–59	Less than 50
PACT-Alt	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic 2	Below Basic 1
Brigance gain	90–100	76–89	60–75	50–59	Less than 50

For each criterion, the value for individual students is assigned and aggregated across criteria and students. The aggregate is divided by the total number of student scores to yield an index.

Absolute Performance Level Ratings

Rating	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 Target
Excellent	3.5 or higher	3.6 or higher	3.7 or higher	3.8 or higher	3.9 or higher	4.0 or more
Good	3.2-3.4	3.3-3.5	3.4-3.6	3.5-3.7	3.6-3.8	3.6-3.9
Average	2.9-3.1	3.0-3.2	3.1-3.5	3.2-3.6	3.3-3.7	3.3-3.5
Below Average	2.7-2.8	2.8-2.9	2.9-3.0	3.0-3.2	3.1-3.3	3.0-3.2
Unsatisfactory	Less than 2.7	Less than 2.8	Less than 2.9	Less than 3.0	Less than 3.1	Less than 3.0

The index determines the school's Absolute Rating. However, in schools with an Excellent or Good rating based on the index the rating will be lowered one level if the school did not meet AYP for the category "all students." For example, if a school had an absolute index of 3.5 in 2005 but did not achieve AYP for "all students," its rating would be lowered from Excellent to Good. A school in 2005 with an index of 3.2 that did not achieve AYP for "all students" would be awarded an Absolute Rating of Average rather than Good.

Improvement Rating

Using the absolute performance indexes, calculate annual gains based on current year minus previous year.

S.C. School for the Deaf and the Blind Improvement Ratings

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	Gains of .3 or above
Good	Gains of .2 to .29
Average	Gains of .1 to .19
Below Average	Gains of .01 to .09
Unsatisfactory	No gain or a loss

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Adjacent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

THE GOVERNOR'S SCHOOL FOR SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS

Students to Be Included in the Rating

Students enrolled in the school as of the forty-fifth day of instruction and continuing through the spring testing period are to be included.

Criteria for the Rating

- ❑ Advanced Placement passage rate: The percentage of students scoring three or above on Advanced Placement examinations.
- ❑ Freshman year GPA: The mean grade point average of students in the fall semester of their freshman year (these data are to be reported on students graduating in the previous year).
- ❑ SAT: The mean SAT performance of graduating seniors.

Calculation of the Index

Absolute Ratings Criteria for the Governor's School for Science and Mathematics

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
AP Passing Rate (.45)	87 or greater	81–86	75–80	69–74	Less than 69
Freshman GPA (.35)	3.5 or greater	3.3–3.49	3.1–3.29	2.9–3.09	Less than 2.9
Mean SAT (.20)	1300 or greater	1260–1299	1170–1259	1120–1169	Less than 1120

Note: Each criterion is weighted as indicated in parentheses.

Absolute Performance Level Ratings

Rating	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 Target
Excellent	3.5 or higher	3.6 or higher	3.7 or higher	3.8 or higher	3.9 or higher	4.0 or more
Good	3.2–3.4	3.3–3.5	3.4–3.6	3.5–3.7	3.6–3.8	3.6–3.9
Average	2.9–3.1	3.0–3.2	3.1–3.5	3.2–3.6	3.3–3.7	3.3–3.5
Below Average	2.7–2.8	2.8–2.9	2.9–3.0	3.0–3.2	3.1–3.3	3.0–3.2
Unsatisfactory	Less than 2.7	Less than 2.8	Less than 2.9	Less than 3.0	Less than 3.1	Less than 3.0

The index determines the school's Absolute Rating. However, in schools with an Excellent or Good rating based on the index the rating will be lowered one level if the school did not meet AYP for the category "all students." For example, if a school had an absolute index of 3.6 in 2006 but did not achieve AYP for "all students," its rating would be lowered from Excellent to Good. A school in 2006 with an index of 3.3 that did not achieve AYP for "all students" would be awarded an Absolute Rating of Average rather than Good.

Improvement Rating

Using the absolute performance indexes, calculate annual gains based on current year minus previous year.

Governor's School for Science and Mathematics Improvement Rating

Improvement Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	Maintenance of Excellent absolute status or gains of .15 or more
Good	Maintenance of Good absolute status or gains of .10
Average	Gains of .06–.09
Below Average	Gains of .01–.05
Unsatisfactory	No gain or a loss

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Adjacent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

WIL LOU GRAY OPPORTUNITY SCHOOL

Students to Be Included in the Rating

All students who are enrolled in the Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School for either of the two five-month program periods each fiscal year are to be included.

Criteria for the Rating

- ❑ GED completion rate: This is calculated by the number of students who successfully complete the GED test divided by the number of students eligible to take the GED test.
- ❑ Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) gains: This is calculated by determining the percentage of students not eligible to take the GED who achieve a five-month gain in math and reading as measured by pre- and post-TABE results. Students must attain the gain in each of the content areas to qualify as meeting the criterion.
- ❑ The Challenge Program: The number of students completing the Challenge Phase of the Youth Challenge Academy is divided by the number of students entering the Challenge Phase.
- ❑ Community service: The number of community service hours is calculated for each student and the percentage of students reaching levels of service is calculated by dividing the number of students at selected levels of involvement by the total number of students.

Calculation of the Absolute Performance Rating

Assign points (one through five) for each criterion in the following manner:

Absolute Ratings Criteria for the Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School

Criterion (Weight)	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
GED Completion Rate (25%)	81–100%	61–80%	41–60%	20–40%	Below 20%
TABE Reading Gains (12.5%)	81–100%	61–80%	41–60%	20–40%	Below 20%
TABE Math Gains (12.5%)	81–100%	61–80%	41–60%	20–40%	Below 20%
Challenge Phase (25%)	86–100%	71–85%	55–70%	40–54%	Below 40%
Community Service (25%)	100% at forty or more hours, with 25% at more than forty hours and 5% at more than sixty hours	100% at forty or more hours, with 25% at more than forty hours	100% at forty or more hours	90–99% at forty or more hours	Below 90% at forty or more hours

Assignment of Value to Achievement Index

Calculate the achievement index by multiplying the points for each criterion listed above by the appropriate weight, summing the products, and rounding to the nearest tenth of a point.

Absolute Performance Level Ratings

Performance Level	Achievement Index, 2001 and beyond
Excellent	4.0 or above
Good	3.6–3.9
Average	3.3–3.5
Below Average	3.0–3.2
Unsatisfactory	Below 3.0

Improvement Rating

Subtract the achievement index for the prior year from that of the current year to calculate annual gains (improvement index).

Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School Improvement Rating

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	0.4 or greater
Good	0.3
Average	0.1–0.2
Below Average	0.0
Unsatisfactory	-0.1 or less

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Adjacent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

FELTON LABORATORY SCHOOL

This kindergarten through eighth-grade school receives a report card using the same criteria and information used for public schools within local school districts.

JOHN DE LA HOWE SCHOOL

Students to Be Included in the Rating

Students who have participated in the educational program for a minimum of 135 days during the school year are to be included. (John De La Howe School operates on a traditional calendar with an extended session during the summer. The extended session provides students with an opportunity to make up days and catch up in academic subjects that they may have missed while waiting for placement at John de la Howe School. Student attendance is collected on SASI and on paper copies of attendance sheets.)

Criteria for the Rating

- ❑ PACT or Exit Exam performance: This is dependent upon student grade level assignment. For PACT, the English language arts and mathematics tests are included; for the Exit Exam, the results of tenth graders taking the test for the first time will be used.
- ❑ STAR reading and mathematics: Pretest to posttest gains are calculated for each student in each content area and assigned value according to the point structure below. Gains are added together and divided by the number of students tested. Students who should have been tested but are not tested are assigned a point value of zero.
- ❑ Number of high school credits earned each year: The number of credits earned each year is assigned points as shown below.

- ❑ Number of middle school classes passed each year: The number of classes passed each year is assigned points as shown below.

Calculation of the Absolute Performance Rating

Assign points (one through five) for each criterion in the following manner:

Absolute Ratings Criteria for John de la Howe School

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
PACT	Advanced	Proficient	Basic	Below Basic 2	Below Basic 1
Exit Exams	Passed all three	Passed two	Passed one	Passed zero	
STAR Pretest-Posttest Gains	.81–1.0	.61–.80	.41–.60	.21–.40	.20 or less
High School Credits	7	6	5	4	Less than 4
Middle School Classes Passed	7	6	5	4	Less than 4

Add the points together and divide by the total number of students across all measures to determine index for school.

Calculation of Performance Rating

Absolute Performance Level Ratings

Rating	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010 Target
Excellent	3.5 or higher	3.6 or higher	3.7 or higher	3.8 or higher	3.9 or higher	4.0 or more
Good	3.2-3.4	3.3-3.5	3.4-3.6	3.5-3.7	3.6-3.8	3.6–3.9
Average	2.9-3.1	3.0-3.2	3.1-3.5	3.2-3.6	3.3-3.7	3.3–3.5
Below Average	2.7-2.8	2.8-2.9	2.9-3.0	3.0-3.2	3.1-3.3	3.0–3.2
Unsatisfactory	Less than 2.7	Less than 2.8	Less than 2.9	Less than 3.0	Less than 3.1	Less than 3.0

The index determines the school's Absolute Rating.

Calculation of the Improvement Rating

Improvement Rating Levels

Improvement Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	Greater than 0.4
Good	0.21 to 0.4
Average	-0.2 to 0.2
Below Average	-0.4 to -0.21
Unsatisfactory	Less than -0.4

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Adjacent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

S.C. GOVERNOR'S SCHOOL FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Students to Be Included in the Rating

Students enrolled in the school as of the forty-fifth day of instruction and continuing through spring testing period are to be included.

Criteria for the Rating

- ☐ Student participation in state and national arts competitions, auditions, portfolio review, or other by senior year.
- ☐ Student recognition in state and national arts competitions, auditions, portfolio review, or other by senior year.
- ☐ Advanced Placement (one or more courses taken by senior year).
- ☐ Advanced Placement passage rate (exams scored three and above).
- ☐ SAT points scored above national mean.
- ☐ Eligibility for LIFE Scholarship.
- ☐ Seniors awarded scholarships, including LIFE Scholarship.

Calculation of the Index

Absolute Ratings Criteria for S.C. School for the Arts and Humanities

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5 Excellent	4 Good	3 Average	2 Below Average	1 Unsatisfactory
Participation State/Nationals (.20)	85% or above	75–84%	65–74%	55–64%	54% or less
Recognition State/Nationals (.20)	65% or above	55–64%	45–54%	35–44%	34% or less
AP Course Taken (.12)	75% or above	65–74%	55–64%	45–54%	44% or less
AP Exam Pass Rate 3+ (.12)	85% or above	75–84%	65–74%	55–64%	54% or less
SAT Points Above National Mean (.12)	100 points or more	90–99 points	80–89 points	70–79 points	69 points or less
LIFE Scholarship (.12)	70% or above	60–69%	50–59%	40–49%	39% or less
Scholarship Awards (Include LIFE) (.12)	85% or above	75–84%	65–74%	55–64%	54% or less

Note: Each criterion is weighted as indicated in parentheses.

Assignment of Value to Achievement Index

Ratings for each of the seven standards of achievement described herein will determine the school's overall performance level. The performance achieved for each standard, as compared to the criteria established specifically for each standard, will be awarded points based on the following scale:

Excellent = four points
Good = three points
Average = two points
Below = one point
Unsatisfactory = zero points

Absolute Performance Rating

Points awarded for the first two standards will be weighted at 20 percent each, and points awarded for the remaining five standards will be weighted at twelve percent each. Calculate the achievement index by summing the weighted points for each criterion listed above and rounding to the nearest tenth of a point. The total score for achievement will earn an overall rating for absolute performance as provided in the following table.

Absolute Performance and Achievement

Performance Level Rating	Achievement Index
Excellent	3.5 or above
Good	3.0–3.4
Average	2.5–2.9
Below Average	2.0–2.4
Unsatisfactory	Below 2.0

The index determines the school's Absolute Rating. However, in schools with an Excellent or Good rating based on the index the rating will be lowered one level if the school did not meet AYP for the category "all students." For example, if a school had an absolute index of 3.5 in 2006 but did not achieve AYP for "all students," its rating would be lowered from Excellent to Good. A school in 2006 with an index of 3.1 that did not achieve AYP for "all students" would be awarded an Absolute Rating of Average rather than Good.

Improvement Performance Rating

The overall improvement performance rating has been determined, since 2002, using the improvement performance index that has been adopted by the state for all high schools statewide and related provisions. High school improved performance is calculated by subtracting the school's Absolute Rating in the prior year from the current year's Absolute Rating. The difference determines the Improvement Rating as shown in the table below.

High School Improvement Performance Rating Criteria

Rating	Improvement Index
Excellent	0.4 or greater
Good	0.3
Average	0.1–0.2
Below Average	0.0
Unsatisfactory	-0.1 or less

Sample Calculation of an Improvement Rating for a High School

Absolute rating index for school year for which report card is based:	2.4
Absolute rating index for the prior school year:	<u>-2.2</u>
Difference:	0.2
Improvement Rating:	Average

Schools with Absolute Ratings of Excellent in Two Subsequent Years

If a school is rated Excellent for absolute achievement for both the current and the previous years, the school will receive an Improvement Rating of Good. If the school's improvement index for all students is a positive number (i.e., greater than zero), the school's Improvement Rating will be elevated to Excellent. The performance improvement of the groups will also be reported for these schools. Schools achieving an absolute index of 4.8 or higher for two consecutive years will be awarded an Excellent Improvement Rating.

Section III 2007 ACCOUNTABILITY RATING CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

Inclusion of New Assessments in Ratings

New assessments are to be included in school and district Absolute Ratings upon their *third* administration. For example, the PACT Science and Social Studies exams for grades three through eight were administered first in 2003 and data on student performance were included in the November 2005 report card ratings calculations.

Process for Determining Criteria for School/District Profile Information

The process for adding profile components to the annual school or district report card should incorporate four stages: (1) initial study and discussion; (2) study of pilot variable; (3) baseline collection; and (4) inclusion on published report card. At least one year must pass between the baseline collection and publication on the report card.

Minimum Size Requirements

Districts and schools with small numbers of students present a special challenge to the accountability system. There are two types of small numbers situations. One is small numbers of students within a group (e.g., few African-American test-takers in reading). The second is small numbers of total students (e.g., few total students tested).

Districts and schools with small numbers of total students present special challenges regarding the stability of the data as well as the confidentiality of student performance. While all districts and campuses are rated initially under standard evaluation, these small districts and schools are subject to special analysis under the circumstances specified below:

- ❑ If standard evaluation indicates that a rating of Excellent or Good is appropriate, then a special analysis is conducted when there are fewer than thirty total students tested in two or more PACT areas.
- ❑ If standard evaluation indicates that a rating of Below Average or Unsatisfactory may be appropriate, then special analysis is conducted only when there are fewer than thirty total students tested that caused the district/school to be considered Below Average or Unsatisfactory.
- ❑ When the standard evaluation results in a rating of Average, no further analysis is performed, even if the district or campus has fewer than thirty students tested in one or more subjects of the PACT (summed across all grades tested).

If special analysis is necessary, only total student performance is examined. Under special analysis, data will be checked for completeness and accuracy and the ratings adjusted if necessary.

Quantitative Parameters for Each Rating Category

Following analyses of the results from state testing program tests a of the four-year graduation rates, the parameters for each rating category were established by the Education Oversight Committee. The committee is implementing a phase-in of ratings criteria that increases rigor over time.

Reporting of Subgroup Performance

Student performance will be disaggregated in the following categories: gender, ethnicity, disability, Limited English Proficiency, migrant, and lunch status for each subtest. A disaggregated group will be reported if the group is comprised of at least ten students (summed across grades) for each subject area.

Ratings Conditional on the Performance of Student Subgroups

Schools and districts are accountable for the performance of all students regardless of ethnicity or lunch status. Performance levels for groups disaggregated for ethnicity or lunch status will be a condition in the Improvement Ratings consistent with the provisions of Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976, § 59-18-900(C).

Data Reported as “N/A” (School and District Report Cards)

Beginning with the 2002 report cards, “N/AV” (“not available”) should be reported only when appropriate. “N/A” (“not applicable”), “N/C” (“not collected”), “N/R” (“not reported”), or “I/S” (“insufficient sample”) will be reported rather than “N/AV,” when appropriate.

Section IV LONGITUDINALLY MATCHED DATA

“Improvement performance” means the rating a school will receive based on longitudinally matched student data comparing current performance to the previous year's for the purpose of determining student academic growth.

“Longitudinally matched student data” means examining the performance of a single student or a group of students by considering their test scores over time.

For grades three through eight, data will be matched longitudinally at the student level. Data from re-administrations of HSAP to students who fail one or more subtests are matched over time to calculate the longitudinal HSAP passage rate for the high school ratings. The matching of student data may be accomplished by computer, provided that the matching information is consistent for each student and unique to that student. Current matching programs utilize some combination of name and demographic information. The student unique identification number will facilitate the matching process as it is phased into the school district and state data systems.

EOC staff are constructing longitudinal student databases based on PACT data. These databases include data from all students statewide whose data can be matched for each year beginning with the year they take the grade 3 PACT tests. The database consisting of six years of data from students enrolled in grade 3 in 2000 is currently being analyzed. A study of five years of longitudinal data from this cohort is reported on the EOC web site (www.sceoc.org).

Section V SCHOOLS SIMILAR IN STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Districts and Schools Similar in Student Characteristics

The statutory authority for this section is from the Code of Laws of South Carolina, Section 59-18-900(C):

In setting the criteria for the academic performance ratings and the performance indicators, the Education Oversight Committee shall report the performance by subgroups of students in the school and schools similar in student characteristics. Criteria must use established guidelines for statistical analysis and build on current data-reporting practices.

Comparison schools for special schools are those similar in relevant student characteristics—for example, schools in which 100 percent of the students have Individualized Education Plans under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act that require either assessment with PACT Alternate Assessment and/or a special school placement as the least restrictive environment.

Building School Groups

As a result of a series of analyses and discussions among educators, a variable that combines information about the percentage of students in a school eligible for Medicaid services and the percentage participating in free or reduced-price lunch services (percent poverty, or PPOV) has been identified as the grouping variable for similar schools. PPOV was identified as the grouping variable based on its strong correlation with student outcome measures (see the *2000–2001 Accountability Manual* for a description of this analysis). The inclusion of Medicaid as an indicator of poverty is important for some schools and pockets of the population where families and individual students are resistant to applying for free or reduced-price meals.

Schools are banded in such a way that each school is at the center of its own band of schools similar in student characteristics (except for schools at the extremes). Schools and school units are categorized as elementary, middle, or high, as previously defined (see pages seven and eight of this manual). Bands are based on the range in percentages. Schools are banded in such a way that other schools with PPOV within plus- or minus- five percentage points will be included in the school's band. Using this methodology results in band groupings that vary in the number of schools but that are similar in terms of the percentage of economically disadvantaged students.

In the 2004–2005 school year (most recent data available), PPOV for schools ranged from 5.2 percent to 100 percent, with a statewide mean of 68.2 percent. School bands will be recalculated annually. The band width will be determined annually based on the distribution of PPOV.

Section VI PALMETTO GOLD AND SILVER AWARDS CRITERIA

Statutory Authority

The statutory authority for the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards is from the Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976 (Supp. 2002):

§ 59-18-1100. The State Board of Education, working with the division and the Department of Education, must establish the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program to recognize and reward schools for academic achievement. Awards will be established for schools attaining high levels of absolute performance and for schools attaining high rates of improvement. The award program must be based upon improved performance on longitudinally matched student data and may include such additional criteria as:

- (1) student attendance;
- (2) teacher attendance;
- (3) student dropout rates; and
- (4) any other factors promoting or maintaining high levels of achievement and performance.

Schools shall be rewarded according to specific criteria established by the division. In defining eligibility for a reward for high levels of performance, student performance should exceed expected levels of improvement. The State Board of Education shall promulgate regulations to ensure districts of the State utilize these funds to improve or maintain exceptional performance according to their schools' plans established in Section 59-139-10. Funds may be utilized for professional development support.

Special schools for the academically talented are not eligible to receive an award pursuant to the provision of this section unless they have demonstrated improvement and high absolute achievement for three years immediately preceding.

Overview

The Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program was established by the Education Accountability Act of 1998. As an important part of the education accountability system in South Carolina, the awards program is designed to recognize and reward "schools for attaining high levels of absolute performance and schools for attaining high rates of improvement."

The Division of Accountability is responsible for developing criteria for the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program. As with other efforts, an advisory group of South Carolina educators was formed to recommend criteria and statistical procedures. The criteria and procedures utilized for selecting schools to receive the Gold and Silver Awards are based on the *Criteria for School and District Ratings* as approved by the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee on December 6, 2000.

The criteria and procedures established for the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program reflect a fundamental belief that all schools, regardless of their socioeconomic status and geographic location, can improve toward high academic standards and excellence and that all

children can learn at high levels. Schools will be recognized not only for high levels of student academic achievement but also for efforts that result in exemplary improvement.

In developing the criteria and procedures, the following essential elements were taken into consideration: fairness and equity, raising the performance levels of historically underachieving groups, and inclusiveness of as many schools as possible.

Criteria and Procedures

Eligibility

All schools and career and technology centers with student learning achievement outcome data will be eligible for participation in the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program. No application is required.

There are no additional requirements for percentage of students tested and the inclusion of special education students, since the methodology for calculating the Absolute and Improvement Ratings addresses these issues.

According to the Education Accountability Act of 1998, Section 59-18-1100, “special schools for the academically talented are not eligible to receive an award pursuant to the provision of this section unless they have demonstrated improvement and high absolute achievement for three years immediately preceding.”

Performance of Subgroups of Students and Gap Reduction

The criteria address improvement of performance for historically underachieving subgroups. There are three student subgroups to be considered:

- ☐ minority students,
- ☐ free/reduced-price meal students, and
- ☐ students with non-speech disabilities.

Note: Two additional groups were added for the 2002–2003 awards determination: Limited English Proficient (LEP) students and migrant students.

Minority students will be defined as African-American, Hispanic, or Native American students. These students will be combined for purposes of analysis. There must be at least thirty students in each subgroup in a school for the group to be considered. The method for considering the performance of subgroup improvement defined in the *Criteria for School and District Ratings* will be used as gap-reduction criteria. If the improvement index for each historically underachieving subgroup in the school exceeds the state two-year average improvement index by at least one standard deviation, the school's Improvement Rating will be increased by one level.

Criteria for Selecting Schools for Awards: Grades Three through Eight, Career and Technology Centers, and Special Schools

Three procedures will be utilized to select schools that meet the criteria for attaining high levels of absolute performance and high rates of improvement. Schools that are selected through any of the three procedures will be recognized through the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program.

Primary Selection Procedure: Based on Absolute Performance and Improvement Ratings

The procedure is a combination of the absolute performance and Improvement Ratings as prescribed in the *Criteria for School and District Ratings*. The Improvement Rating used for selection of award-recipient schools includes adjustment for gap reduction.

To qualify for a Gold or Silver Award, a school's absolute performance rating must be above Unsatisfactory. Schools will receive a Gold or a Silver Award when one of the following conditions occurs:

- ❑ Schools with an Excellent rating in absolute performance will receive a Gold Award for high level of academic performance as long as their Improvement Rating is equal to or above Average.
- ❑ Schools with an Excellent rating in improvement will receive a Gold Award for high levels of improvement as long as their absolute performance rating is above Unsatisfactory.
- ❑ Schools with a Good rating in improvement will receive a Silver Award for good improvement results as long as their absolute performance rating is above Unsatisfactory.

The following table shows the selection procedure:

Gold and Silver Awards Criteria

Absolute Performance Rating	Improvement Rating	Award Designation
Excellent	Excellent	Gold
Excellent	Good	Gold
Excellent	Average	Gold
Good	Excellent	Gold
Good	Good	Silver
Average	Excellent	Gold
Average	Good	Silver
Below Average	Excellent	Gold
Below Average	Good	Silver

Second Selection Procedure: Based on High Improvement Ranking by School Type

In order to ensure that each of the three school types (elementary, middle, and secondary) are approximately evenly recognized through the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program, the following three steps will be performed each year:

- ❑ Rank order the improvement index for each school by school type.
- ❑ Select the schools with an improvement index percentile rank of eighty-fifth or higher, provided the improvement index is at least 0.15.
- ❑ Exclude schools that have an Unsatisfactory rating for absolute performance.

A school would be selected to receive a Silver Award if its percentile rank for its improvement index is eighty-fifth or higher among the schools of the same type housing similar grades and its absolute performance rating is above Unsatisfactory.

Third Selection Procedure: Based on Steady Growth over Three or More Consecutive Years

A school may qualify for a Silver Award if the school's absolute performance rating is above Unsatisfactory for the most recent year, and

- ❑ its improvement index is 0.20 or greater for two consecutive years, or
- ❑ its improvement index is 0.15 or greater for three consecutive years.

Schools Enrolling Students in Only Grade Two or Below

Schools enrolling students in only grade two or below will not qualify for a Palmetto Gold or Silver Award for lack of student learning achievement outcome data.

Wil Lou Gray Special School

The school may qualify for an award on its absolute performance and Improvement Ratings as defined in *Criteria for School and District Ratings*. However, the advisory group recommends that the committee reconvene to examine the criteria and data available again after two years.

Career and Technology Centers

Career and technology centers may qualify for a Gold or Silver Award based on the criteria developed for generating the center report cards. These three criteria are

- ❑ mastering for competencies or certification requirements,
- ❑ graduation rate, and
- ❑ placement rate.

As described in the *Criteria for School and District Ratings*, the mastery criterion will be weighted at twice the value of the other criteria. The proportion of students enrolling is not considered as part of the criteria.

Special Schools for the Academically Talented

According to the Education Accountability Act of 1998, Section 59-18-1100, "special schools for the academically talented are not eligible to receive an award pursuant to the provision of this section unless they have demonstrated improvement and high absolute achievement for three years immediately preceding."

A special school for the academically talented is a district-operated school that has at least 50 percent of its enrollment of students based upon predicted or realized high achievement from across multiple school attendance zones.

Special schools for the academically talented will qualify to receive a Gold Award when one of the following conditions occurs:

- ❑ Beginning with the school year 1999–2000, schools with an Excellent rating in absolute performance for three consecutive years will receive a Gold Award for attaining high levels of academic performance as long as their Improvement Rating is equal to or above Average for the most recent year.
- ❑ Schools with an Excellent rating in absolute performance for three consecutive years and an absolute performance index value of 4.5 for the most recent year will receive a Gold Award for attaining high levels of achievement.

Criteria for Selecting Schools for Awards: High Schools

Eligibility

Schools receiving a high school report card, in accordance with procedures outlined in the *Accountability Manual*, with student learning achievement outcome data will be eligible for participation in the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program. Special schools for the academically talented are eligible in accordance with the requirements outlined in Section 59-18-1100 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina. These requirements state that "special schools for the academically talented are not eligible to receive an award pursuant to the provisions of this section unless they have demonstrated improvement and high absolute achievement for three years immediately preceding." No application is required.

Award Criteria

Two procedures are employed to select schools that meet the criteria for attaining high levels of absolute performance and high rates of improvement. Schools that are selected through one of the two procedures are recognized through the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program.

Selection Procedure Based on Absolute Performance and Improvement Ratings

This procedure is a combination of the absolute performance and Improvement Ratings as prescribed in the *Criteria for School and District Ratings*. The Improvement Rating used for selection of award-recipient schools includes an adjustment for gap reduction. To qualify for a Gold or Silver Award, a school's absolute performance rating must be above Unsatisfactory. Schools will receive a Gold or Silver Award when one of the following three conditions occurs:

- ❑ A school with an Excellent rating in absolute performance will receive a Gold Award for high levels of academic performance as long as its Improvement Rating is equal to or above Average.
- ❑ A school with an Excellent rating in improvement will receive a Gold Award for high levels of improvement as long as its absolute performance rating is above Unsatisfactory.
- ❑ A school with a Good rating in improvement will receive a Silver Award for good improvement results as long as its absolute performance rating is above Unsatisfactory.

The following table outlines the ratings blend for the awards:

Gold and Silver Awards Criteria

Absolute Performance Rating	Improvement Rating	Award Designation
Excellent	Excellent	Gold
Excellent	Good	Gold
Excellent	Average	Gold
Good	Excellent	Gold
Good	Good	Silver
Average	Excellent	Gold
Average	Good	Silver
Below Average	Excellent	Gold
Below Average	Good	Silver

Selection Procedure Based on Steady Growth over at Least Two Consecutive Years

This procedure is based upon steady growth demonstrated over a minimum of two consecutive years. A school may qualify for a Silver Award if the school's absolute performance rating is above Unsatisfactory for the most recent year, and

- ❑ its improvement index is 0.20 or greater for two consecutive years, or
- ❑ its improvement index is 0.10 or greater for three consecutive years.

The 2000–2001 school year is set as the base year.

Procedure for Special High Schools for the Academically Talented

A special school for the academically talented is a district-operated school that has at least 50 percent of its enrollment of students based upon predicted or realized high achievement from across multiple school attendance zones.

Special schools for academically talented will qualify to receive a Gold Award when one of the following two conditions occurs:

- ❑ Beginning with the 2000–2001 school year, a school with an Excellent rating in absolute performance for three consecutive years will receive a Gold Award for attaining high levels of academic performance.
- ❑ A school with a Good or Excellent rating in absolute performance for three consecutive years and an absolute performance index value of 4.5 for the most recent year will receive a Gold Award for attaining high levels of achievement.

Allocation of Funds and Non-Achievement Criteria

School financial awards will be calculated on a per pupil basis in accordance with the particular criteria met. A school qualifying for a financial award will receive 80 percent of the per pupil allocation, plus up to an additional 20 percent based on the following criteria:

- ❑ student attendance, criterion set at a minimum of 97 percent;
- ❑ teacher attendance, criterion set at a minimum of 97 percent; and
- ❑ annual dropout rate, grades nine through twelve, criterion set at a maximum of 2.5 percent.

Schools qualifying for a Silver Award will receive two-thirds of the per-pupil allocation of schools receiving a Gold Award.

Section VI REPORT CARD INFORMATION AND PRESENTATION

Decisions on format and design of the report cards were made with the participation of members of the Education Oversight Committee, members of the State Board of Education, and the State Superintendent of Education. The data listed on each page of the school and district report cards are indicated in appendix D, Table of Specifications by School or District for Report Card Data.

The format and presentation, including issues of readability, are to be addressed in the annual reviews conducted by the Education Oversight Committee.

General Design Issues

The report card is to be printed in a format providing multiple pages of information (an eight-and-one-half-by-eleven-inch sheet, folded).

Note: Federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation may require additional modifications to some aspects of the report cards described in this edition of the *Accountability Manual*.

Section VIII

SYSTEM SAFEGUARDS

Ratings Impact

The State Department of Education conducts procedures to ensure that student performance on the PACT is measured properly and that accurate data are collected. Data used to rate schools and districts should undergo routine screening before and after the release of accountability ratings. The Education Oversight Committee bears responsibility for the annual review to determine the utilization of the report card and the impact of the accountability system on student, school, and district performance.

Serious Data Problems

If data problems of sufficient magnitude to question the validity of any accountability rating are uncovered, then the SDE should take one or more of the following steps after consulting with the district:

- ❑ Attempts will be made to rectify the data problems within the accountability calendar.
- ❑ If the problem cannot be resolved by the rating release date, then
 - a delayed rating may be issued; or
 - if the problem pertains to assessment data, ratings may be determined using assessment results for "all students tested."

Ratings Changes

The State Department of Education may change ratings of schools and districts after November 1 if problems in the data used to determine the ratings subsequently are discovered. In March 2006 the SDE reported changes to the ratings published in November 2005 for seventeen schools and five school districts.

Analyses Undertaken Prior to the Release of Ratings

Analyses to examine data reasonableness are undertaken prior to applying accountability system criteria. The State Department of Education and the Division of Accountability should analyze current year accountability information to include: the percent of test-takers at each school; excessive numbers of students having modified or alternate test forms; excessive absences during testing; unusual increases in percentage of students with disabilities; excessive rates of student mobility; and unusual changes in indicator or fact data. Secondly, the testing contractor for the student assessment program should notify the SDE of potential data problems for a school district. The school district is contacted by the State Department of Education about potential data problems for a school district.

The State Department of Education is responsible for the data collection and printing of the annual school and district report cards. This work includes analyses checking for incomplete results or data, inconsistency with assessment results, and other anomalies. The Education Accountability Act (Section 59-18-900) was amended in 2006 directing the State Board of Education to promulgate regulations outlining the procedures for data collection, data accuracy, data reporting, and consequences for failure to provide required data.

Questions

Inquiries concerning the analyses prior to the release of the ratings should be directed to the State Department of Education.

Analyses Undertaken after the Release of Ratings

The Education Oversight Committee assumes responsibility for annual and longitudinal reviews of the accountability system.

The annual reviews will address the following:

- ❑ the format and readability of the school and district report card;
- ❑ public and professional access to the report card and their use of it;
- ❑ patterns within the data reported;
- ❑ identification of potential data sources to increase understanding of school processes and results;
- ❑ accuracy in data reporting and analyses;
- ❑ study of the performance of subgroups of the student population; and
- ❑ other elements as identified by policymakers.

The longitudinal reviews of the accountability system will address the following:

- ❑ use and misuse of the system;
- ❑ intended and unintended consequences;
- ❑ validity of the ratings methodologies and categorical definitions;
- ❑ impact of the system on student, school, district, and state performance; and
- ❑ other studies as identified by policymakers.

Section IX LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Public notification of accountability results and utilization in school and district improvement efforts are governed by multiple statutory requirements. These are described in this section. The text of the statutes is provided in appendix A.

Report Card Narrative

The principal, in conjunction with the School Improvement Council, must write an annual narrative of a school's progress in order to further inform parents and the community about the school and its operation. The narrative must cite factors or activities supporting progress and barriers that inhibit progress.

Distribution of the Report Card

The school and district report cards must be furnished to schools no later than November 1 and to parents and the public no later than November 15. School and district report cards are mailed to parents of the school and the school district by the State Department of Education if sufficient funds are available. Schools, in conjunction with the school district board, must also advertise the results of their report card in an audited newspaper of general circulation in their geographic area within forty-five days of receipt of the report cards from the State Department of Education. The advertising requirement is waived if the audited newspaper has previously published the entire report card results as a news item.

Development of Local Accountability Systems

Each district board of trustees must establish and annually review a performance-based accountability system, or modify its existing system, to reinforce the state accountability system. Parents, teachers, and principals must be involved in the development, annual review, and revisions of the accountability system established by the district.

This accountability system must be developed in accordance with regulations of the State Board of Education.

Annual school improvement reports must be provided to parents on or by April 30.

Intervention and Assistance

When a school or district receives a rating of Below Average or Unsatisfactory, the school must undertake the actions outlined in the Code of Laws of South Carolina, Sections 59-18-1500 through 1590. These statutes establish the basis for improvement, assistance, and intervention and should be developed with the support of the State Department of Education.

Opportunities for Data Correction

Each data source for information published on the annual school or district report card has a prescribed process and calendar for collecting the information. The accuracy of ratings, recognitions, report cards, and other reports is in large measure dependent on the accuracy of the information submitted. Districts are responsible for submitting all data with the exception of testing results that are transmitted by the testing companies. The opportunities for correction of data are specified by the State Department of Education.

Section X PREVIEW OF THE 2007–2008 ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

System Evolution

From its inception, the accountability system was designed to evolve over time to encourage higher levels of student performance, incorporate additional information, meet statutory requirements as quickly as possible, and improve the information with which accountability decisions are made.

In order to provide schools and districts with adequate time to prepare for the rigor of the standards, this section presents a preview of how the accountability system is expected to evolve over the next few years.

Assumptions for Change

Additions and/or modifications of the state assessment system may require modifications of the ratings calculations. For example, in 2004, first-attempt HSAP performance was added as a criterion for the high school ratings and in 2005 PACT Science and Social Studies were added to the calculation of the elementary and middle school ratings. Scheduled changes to the rating are listed in the following table:

Schedule for Studies of and Changes to School and District Report Card Ratings

Report Card	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Primary Schools	Advisory group reviews rating criteria to determine if criteria more sensitive to programmatic differences can be identified and implemented	Pilot new criteria and simulate results	Implement new criteria indicated from pilot study	
Elementary Schools	<p><u>Absolute ratings:</u> Add PACT Social Studies and Science results (weighted 10% each) to ELA and Math results (weighted 40% each)</p> <p><u>Improvement ratings:</u> Add PACT Social Studies and Science results (weighted 20% each) to ELA and Math results (weighted 30% each)</p>	<p><u>Absolute ratings:</u> Increase PACT Social Studies and Science result weights to 15% each and decrease ELA and Math result weights to 35% each</p> <p><u>Improvement ratings:</u> No change</p>	<p><u>Absolute ratings:</u> Increase PACT Social Studies and Science result weights to 20% each and decrease ELA and Math result weights to 30% each</p> <p><u>Improvement ratings:</u> No change</p> <p>Conduct studies of roles of PACT performance levels in accountability system and possible use of measures of persistently low student performance for accountability</p>	Percentage of students who attended a preschool program studied for possible reporting
Middle Schools	<p><u>Absolute ratings:</u> Add PACT Social Studies and Science results (weighted 15% each) to ELA and Math results (weighted 35% each)</p> <p><u>Improvement ratings:</u> Add PACT Social Studies and Science results (weighted 25% each) to ELA and Math results (weighted 25% each)</p>	<p><u>Absolute ratings:</u> Increase PACT Social Studies and Science result weights to 20% and decrease ELA and Math result weights to 30% each</p> <p><u>Improvement ratings:</u> No change</p>	<p><u>Absolute ratings:</u> Increase PACT Social Studies and Science result weights to 25% each and decrease ELA and Math result weights to 25% each</p> <p><u>Improvement ratings:</u> No change</p> <p>Conduct studies of roles of PACT performance levels in accountability system and possible use of measures of persistently low student performance for accountability</p>	

Report Card	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
High Schools	No change from 2003-2004	Replace longitudinal BSAP Exit Exam with longitudinal HSAP high school examination data	Replace LIFE Scholarship criteria with end-of-course test results Conduct study of possible use of measures of student attainment of credits toward diploma for accountability	Results from measure of foreign language program reported
Districts	Add PACT Social Studies and Science results to ELA and Math results to elementary and middle school components of district ratings, applying same weightings for each test as used for elementary and middle schools in 2004-2005	Increase weights for PACT Social Studies and Science results and decrease weights for ELA and Math results when calculating the elementary and middle school components of district ratings, applying same weightings for each test as used for elementary and middle school ratings in 2005-2006 Replace LIFE Scholarship criteria with end-of-course test results for high school component of ratings Add district high school graduation rate to ratings criteria	Increase weights for PACT Social Studies and Science results and decrease weights for ELA and Math results when calculating the elementary and middle school components of district ratings, applying same weightings for each test as used for elementary and middle school ratings in 2006-2007 Plan for report card for State Charter School District	Report card for State Charter School District distributed
Career and Technology Centers	Advisory group reviews rating criteria to determine if criteria more sensitive to programmatic differences can be identified and implemented	Advisory group reviews rating criteria to determine if criteria more sensitive to programmatic differences can be identified and implemented	Pilot new criteria and simulate results	

What Is Expected to Stay the Same through the 2007 Report Card

- ❑ The ratings categories
- ❑ The use of disaggregated student groups
- ❑ PACT results for accountability purposes based upon the forty-fifth day membership
- ❑ Provisions for small numbers of students
- ❑ Statutory recognitions based on the performance results

Planning for the Future

The outline in this section presents data elements that may be added over the next several years. These include the following:

- ❑ School technology indicators (such as ratio of instructional computers to students in school) for reporting will be developed and piloted.
- ❑ Measures of library resources (such as average age of media collection) will be developed and piloted.
- ❑ The percentage of elementary school students who attended a four-year-old preschool program will be studied for possible inclusion in the profile section of the report cards.
- ❑ Foreign language: The South Carolina Foreign Language Teachers Association developed a measure of program quality for high school foreign language programs. The EOC adopted the measure for implementation in the 2007-2008 school year for reporting in the profile section of high school report cards in November 2008. The background information describing the foreign language quality measure is available on the EOC web site, www.sceoc.org.
- ❑ Beginning with the 2007–2008 school year, data from the end-of-course assessment in U.S. History and Constitution will be included along with data from the other end-of-course tests in the calculation of the high school and school district ratings.
- ❑ A report card for the State Charter School District is planned for distribution in 2008.
- ❑ Other changes in response to changes in the statutory provisions may include changes called for in federal legislation (No Child Left Behind).

Section XI ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Calendar for 2006–2007

December/May/July	End-of-course test administrations
March	2007 HSAP Examination administration; review of <i>Accountability Manual</i> (and any proposed changes)
April/May	2007 PACT administration
Summer	Review of 2007 PACT performance, HSAP administration results
	District superintendents submit questions regarding school or district data calculations
First day of school year	Request for program unit to receive report card
November 1	SDE distribution of school and district report cards to schools and districts
November 15	Distribution of school and district report cards to parents and community members
Within 45 days	Publication of notice about report cards in area newspapers

Persons to Call with Questions

Data definitions:	Dr. David Burnett, SDE	734-8215
	Mr. David Potter, EOC	734-6148
Data collections:	Dr. David Burnett, SDE	734-8215
	Mr. David Potter, EOC	734-6148
Rating methodologies:	Mr. David Potter, EOC	734-6148
Similar schools:	Mr. David Potter, EOC	734-6148
Assessments:	Dr. Teri Siskind, SDE	734-8298
Publication of report card:	Ms. Elizabeth Carpentier, SDE	734-8169
General concerns:	Dr. Jo Anne Anderson, EOC	734-6148
	Ms. Elizabeth Carpentier , SDE	734-8169

Appendixes

Appendix A:	The Education Accountability Act of 1998 (as amended in 2006) and 2006-2007 Appropriations Act Provisos Related to the Accountability System
Appendix B:	2003 - 2005 Report Card Ratings and Changes Recommended
Appendix C:	Definitions and Formulas for School or District Profile Information
Appendix D:	Table of Specifications by School or District for Report Card Data

APPENDIX A

**The Education Accountability Act of 1998
(as amended in 2006)
Title 59 of the Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976**

and

**2006-2007 Appropriations Act Provisos Related to the Accountability
System**

AN ACT TO AMEND CHAPTER 18 OF TITLE 59, CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 1976, RELATING TO QUALITY CONTROLS AND PRODUCTIVITY REWARDS, SO AS TO ENACT THE SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1998 TO ESTABLISH STATEWIDE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS OF THOSE STANDARDS FOR SCHOOLS, TO PROVIDE ANNUAL REPORT CARDS FOR SCHOOLS WITH A PERFORMANCE INDICATOR SYSTEM, TO REQUIRE DISTRICTS TO ESTABLISH LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS, TO PROVIDE SPECIFIED RESOURCES TO IMPROVE STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND TEACHER AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE, AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION AND OVERSIGHT OF THE ABOVE PROVISIONS; TO ADD SECTION 59-24-5 SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR LEGISLATIVE FINDINGS IN REGARD TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND THEIR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT; TO AMEND SECTIONS 59-24-10, 59-24-30, BOTH AS AMENDED, AND 59-24-50, RELATING TO ASSESSMENT OF AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, SO AS TO FURTHER PROVIDE FOR SUCH ASSESSMENTS AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS; TO ADD SECTION 59-24-80 SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR A FORMAL INDUCTION PROGRAM FOR FIRST-YEAR PRINCIPALS; TO ADD SECTION 59-24-15 SO AS TO PROVIDE THAT CERTIFIED EDUCATION PERSONNEL WHO ARE EMPLOYED AS ADMINISTRATORS ON AN ANNUAL OR MULTI-YEAR CONTRACT WILL RETAIN THEIR RIGHTS AS A TEACHER UNDER APPLICABLE EMPLOYMENT, DISMISSAL, AND OTHER PROCEDURES BUT NO SUCH RIGHTS ARE GRANTED TO THE POSITION OR SALARY OF ADMINISTRATOR, AND TO PROVIDE THAT ANY SUCH ADMINISTRATOR WHO PRESENTLY IS UNDER A CONTRACT GRANTING SUCH RIGHTS SHALL RETAIN THAT STATUS UNTIL THE EXPIRATION OF THAT CONTRACT; TO AMEND SECTION 59-6-10, RELATING TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE THE EIA, SO AS TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE, TO REVISE THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE AND THE MANNER IN WHICH ITS MEMBERS ARE SELECTED, AND TO REVISE ITS DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS INCLUDING A REQUIREMENT THAT IT REVIEW AND MONITOR THE EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1998; TO ADD SECTIONS 59-6-100, 59-6-110, AND 59-6-120 SO AS TO ESTABLISH AN ACCOUNTABILITY DIVISION WITHIN THE EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE AND PROVIDE FOR ITS DUTIES, FUNCTIONS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES, TO PROVIDE THAT THE EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE SHALL APPOINT A TASK FORCE TO REVIEW CURRENT STATE PROGRAMS AND POLICIES FOR PARENT PARTICIPATION IN THEIR CHILDREN'S EDUCATION; TO AMEND SECTION 59-29-10, RELATING TO REQUIRED SUBJECTS OF INSTRUCTION, SO AS TO REQUIRE INSTRUCTION IN PHONICS; TO ADD SECTION 59-63-65 SO AS TO PROVIDE THAT SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH CHOOSE TO REDUCE CLASS SIZE IN GRADES ONE THROUGH THREE TO A PUPIL-TEACHER RATIO OF FIFTEEN TO ONE SHALL BE ELIGIBLE FOR CERTAIN STATE FUNDING, AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE PROVISIONS INCLUDING A PROVISION ALLOWING PORTABLE OR TEMPORARY FACILITIES TO BE USED FROM FUNDING DERIVED FROM THE CHILDREN'S EDUCATION ENDOWMENT FUND, TO REQUIRE THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO PROVIDE A COPY OF THIS ACT TO EVERY DISTRICT SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT AND SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN THIS STATE; TO REPEAL SECTION 59-6-12 RELATING TO CERTAIN DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE; AND TO REPEAL SECTIONS 59-18-10, 59-18-11, 59-18-15, 59-18-20, 59-18-25, 59-18-30, AND 59-18-31 RELATING TO SCHOOL QUALITY CONTROLS AND PRODUCTIVITY.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina:

Citation

SECTION 1. This act will be known and may be cited as the "South Carolina Education Accountability Act of 1998."

Education Accountability Act of 1998

SECTION 2. Chapter 18, Title 59 of the 1976 Code is amended to read:

EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1998**ARTICLE 1.****GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SECTION 59-18-100. Performance based accountability system for public education established; "accountability" defined.

The General Assembly finds that South Carolinians have a commitment to public education and a conviction that high expectations for all students are vital components for improving academic achievement. It is the purpose of the General Assembly in this chapter to establish a performance based accountability system for public education which focuses on improving teaching and learning so that students are equipped with a strong academic foundation. Accountability, as defined by this chapter, means acceptance of the responsibility for improving student performance and taking actions to improve classroom practice and school performance by the Governor, the General Assembly, the State Department of Education, colleges and universities, local school boards, administrators, teachers, parents, students, and the community.

SECTION 59-18-110. Objectives.

The system is to:

- (1) use academic achievement standards to push schools and students toward higher performance by aligning the state assessment to those standards and linking policies and criteria for performance standards, accreditation, reporting, school rewards, and targeted assistance;
- (2) provide an annual report card with a performance indicator system that is logical, reasonable, fair, challenging, and technically defensible which furnishes clear and specific information about school and district academic performance and other performance to parents and the public;
- (3) require all districts to establish local accountability systems to stimulate quality teaching and learning practices and target assistance to low performing schools;
- (4) provide resources to strengthen the process of teaching and learning in the classroom to improve student performance and reduce gaps in performance;
- (5) support professional development as integral to improvement and to the actual work of teachers and school staff; and
- (6) expand the ability to evaluate the system and to conduct in-depth studies on implementation, efficiency, and the effectiveness of academic improvement efforts.

SECTION 59-18-120. Definitions.

As used in this chapter:

- (1) "Oversight Committee" means the Education Oversight Committee established in Section 59-6-10.
- (2) "Standards based assessment" means an assessment where an individual's performance is compared to specific performance standards and not to the performance of other students.
- (3) "Disaggregated data" means data broken out for specific groups within the total student population, such as by race, gender, and family income level.
- (4) "Longitudinally matched student data" means examining the performance of a single student or a group of students by considering their test scores over time.
- (5) "Norm-referenced assessment" means assessments designed to compare student performance to a nationally representative sample of similar students known as the norm group.
- (6) "Academic achievement standards" means statements of expectations for student learning.
- (7) "Department" means the State Department of Education.
- (8) "Absolute performance" means the rating a school will receive based on the percentage of students meeting standard on the state's standards based assessment.
- (9) "Improvement performance" means the rating a school will receive based on longitudinally matched student data comparing current performance to the previous year's for the purpose of determining student academic growth.
- (10) "Objective and reliable statewide assessment" means assessments that yield consistent results and that measure the cognitive knowledge and skills specified in the state-approved academic standards and do not include questions relative to personal opinions, feelings, or attitudes and are not biased with regard to race, gender, or socioeconomic status. The assessments must include a writing assessment and multiple-choice questions designed to reflect a range of cognitive abilities beyond the knowledge level. Constructive response questions may be included as a component of the writing assessment."
- (11) "Division of Accountability" means the special unit within the oversight committee established in Section 59-6-100.
- (12) 'Formative assessment' means assessments used within the school year to analyze general strengths and weaknesses in learning and instruction, to understand the performance of students individually and across achievement categories, to adapt instruction to meet students' needs, and to consider placement and planning for the next grade level. Data and performance from the formative assessments must not be used in the calculation of school or district ratings.

ARTICLE 3. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS

SECTION 59-18-300. Adoption of educational standards in core academic areas.

The State Board of Education is directed to adopt grade specific performance-oriented educational standards in the core academic areas of mathematics, English/language arts, social studies (history, government, economics, and geography), and science for kindergarten through twelfth grade and for grades nine through twelve adopt specific academic standards for benchmark courses in mathematics, English/language arts, social studies, and science. The standards are to promote the goals of providing every student with the competencies to:

- (1) read, view, and listen to complex information in the English language;
- (2) write and speak effectively in the English language;
- (3) solve problems by applying mathematics;
- (4) conduct research and communicate findings;
- (5) understand and apply scientific concepts;
- (6) obtain a working knowledge of world, United States, and South Carolina history, government, economics, and geography; and

(7) use information to make decisions.

The standards must be reflective of the highest level of academic skills with the rigor necessary to improve the curriculum and instruction in South Carolina's schools so that students are encouraged to learn at unprecedented levels and must be reflective of the highest level of academic skills at each grade level.

SECTION 59-18-310. Development or adoption of statewide assessment program to measure student performance.

A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the State Board of Education, through the Department of Education, is required to develop or adopt a statewide assessment program to promote student learning and to measure student performance on state standards and: (1) identify areas in which students need additional support; (2) indicate the academic achievement for schools, districts, and the State; (3) satisfy federal reporting requirements; and (4) provide professional development to educators.

Assessments required to be developed or adopted pursuant to the provisions of this section or chapter must be objective and reliable.

(B) The statewide assessment program in the four academic areas must include grades three through eight, an exit examination in English/language arts and mathematics, which is to be first administered in a student's second year of high school enrollment beginning with grade nine, and end-of-course tests for gateway courses awarded Carnegie units of credit in English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Beginning with the graduating class of 2010, students are required to pass a high school credit course in science and a course in United States history in which end-of-course examinations are administered to receive the state high school diploma.

(C) While assessment is called for in the specific areas mentioned above, this should not be construed as lessening the importance of foreign languages, visual and performing arts, health, physical education, and career or occupational programs.

(D) By March 31, 2007, the State Board of Education shall create a statewide adoption list of formative assessments aligned with the state content standards and satisfying professional measurement standards in accordance with criteria jointly determined by the Education Oversight Committee and the State Department of Education. The formative assessments must provide diagnostic information in a timely manner to all school districts for each student during the course of the school year. For use beginning with the 2007-08 school year, with funds appropriated by the General Assembly, local districts must be allocated resources to select and administer formative assessments from the statewide adoption list to use to improve student performance in accordance with district improvement plans. However, if a local district already administers formative assessments, the district may continue to use the assessments if they meet the state standards and criteria pursuant to this subsection.

(E) The State Board of Education shall adopt a developmentally appropriate formative reading assessment for use in first and second grades to be administered initially in the 2007-08 school year. The assessment must provide opportunities for periodic formative assessment during the school year, reports that are useful for informing classroom instruction, strand, or significant groupings of standards level information about individual students, and must be compatible with best practices in reading instruction and reading research. The State Department of Education shall provide appropriate and on-going professional development to support appropriate use of the assessment.

(F) The State Department of Education shall provide on-going professional development in the development and use of classroom assessments, the use of formative assessments and the use of the end-of-year state assessments so that teaching and learning activities are focused on student needs and lead to higher levels of student performance

SECTION 59-18-320. Review of field test; general administration of test; accommodations for students with disabilities; adoption of new standards.

(A) After the first statewide field test of the assessment program in each of the four academic areas, and after the field tests of the end-of-course assessments of benchmark courses, the Education Oversight Committee, established in Section 59-6-10, will review the state assessment program and the course assessments for alignment with the state standards, level of difficulty and validity, and for the ability to differentiate levels of achievement, and will make recommendations for needed changes, if any. The review will be provided to the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, the Governor, the Senate Education Committee, and the House Education and Public Works Committee as soon as feasible after the field tests. The Department of Education will then report to the Education Oversight Committee no later than one month after receiving the reports on the changes made to the assessments to comply with the recommendations.

(B) After review and approval by the Education Oversight Committee, the standards-based assessment of mathematics, English/language arts, social studies, and science will be administered to all public school students to include those students as required by the 1997 reauthorization of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and by Title 1 at the end of grades three through eight. To reduce the number of days of testing, to the extent possible, field test items must be embedded with the annual assessments. In accordance with the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act, science assessments must be administered annually to all students in one elementary and one middle school grade. The State Department of Education shall develop a sampling plan to administer science and social studies assessments to all other elementary and middle school students. The plan shall provide for all students and both content areas to be assessed annually; however, individual students, except in census testing grades, are not required to take both tests. In the sampling plan, approximately half of the assessments must be administered in science and the other half in social studies in each class. To ensure that school districts maintain the high standard of accountability established in the Education Accountability Act, performance level results reported on school and district report cards must meet consistently high levels in all four core content areas. Beginning with the 2007 report card, the core areas must remain consistent with the following percentage weightings established and approved by the Education Oversight Committee: in grades three through five, thirty percent each for English/language arts and math, and twenty percent each for science and social studies; and in grades six through eight, twenty-five percent each for English/language arts and math, and twenty-five percent each for science and social studies. The exit examination must be administered for the first time at the end of the student's second year of high school enrollment beginning with grade nine. For students with documented disabilities, the assessments developed by the Department of Education shall include the appropriate modifications and accommodations with necessary supplemental devices as outlined in a student's Individualized Education Program and as stated in the Administrative Guidelines and Procedures for Testing Students with Documented Disabilities. The State Board of Education shall establish a task force to recommend alternative evidence and procedures that may be used to allow students to meet graduation requirements even if they have failed the exit examination. The alternative evidence only may be used in the rare instances where there is compelling evidence that a student is well qualified for graduation, but

extreme circumstances have interfered with passage of the exit examination and, for that reason alone, the student would be denied a state high school diploma.

(C) After review and approval by the Education Oversight Committee, the end-of-course assessments of benchmark courses will be administered to all public school students as they complete each benchmark course.

(D) Any new standards and assessments required to be developed and adopted by the State Board of Education, through the Department of Education, must be developed and adopted upon the advice and consent of the Education Oversight Committee.

SECTION 59-18-330. First grade readiness test.

The State Board of Education, through the State Department of Education, shall develop, select, or adapt a first-grade readiness test that is linked to the adopted grade-one academic standards and a second-grade readiness test that is linked to the adopted grade-two academic standards. The purpose of the tests is to measure individual student readiness, and they are not to be used as an accountability measure at the state level. However, the grade-two readiness test will serve as the baseline for grade-three assessment. The State Department of Education shall provide continuing teacher training to ensure the valid and reliable use of the assessments and develop a minimum statewide data collection plan to include the amount and types of evidence to be collected. Beginning with the 2006-07 school year, the readiness assessment must be modified to provide detailed information on student literacy development.

SECTION 59-18-340. National Assessment of Educational Progress

The State Board of Education is directed to administer annually the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) to obtain an indication of student and school performance relative to national performance levels.

SECTION 59-18-350. PSAT or PLAN tests of tenth grade students; availability; use of results.

High schools shall offer state-funded PSAT or PLAN tests to each tenth grade student in order to assess and identify curricular areas that need to be strengthened and re-enforced. Schools and districts shall use these assessments as diagnostic tools to provide academic assistance to students whose scores reflect the need for such assistance. Schools and districts shall use these assessments to provide guidance and direction for parents and students as they plan for postsecondary experiences.

SECTION 59-18-360. Cyclical review of state standards and assessments by academic area.

(A) The State Board of Education, in consultation with the Education Oversight Committee, shall provide for a cyclical review by academic area of the state standards and assessments to ensure that the standards and assessments are maintaining high expectations for learning and teaching. All academic areas must be initially reviewed by the year 2005. At a minimum, each academic area should be reviewed and updated every seven years. After each academic area is reviewed, a report on the recommended revisions must be presented to the Education Oversight Committee for its consideration. After approval by the Education Oversight Committee, the recommendations may be implemented. As a part of the review, a task force of parents, business and industry persons, community leaders, and educators, to include special education teachers, shall examine the standards and assessment system to determine rigor and relevancy.

(B) Beginning with the 2005 assessment results, the State Department of Education annually shall convene a team of curriculum experts to analyze the results of the assessments, including performance item by item. This analysis must yield a plan for disseminating additional information about the assessment results and instruction and the information must be disseminated to districts not later than January fifteenth of the subsequent year.

SECTION 59-18-370. Dissemination of assessment results.

The Department of Education is directed to provide assessment results annually on individual students and schools in a manner and format that is easily understood by parents and the public. In addition, the school assessment results must be presented in a format easily understood by the faculty and in a manner that is useful for curriculum review and instructional improvement. The department is to provide longitudinally matched student data from the standards based assessments and include information on the performance of subgroups of students within the school. The department must work with the Division of Accountability in developing the formats of the assessment results. Schools and districts shall be responsible for disseminating this information to parents.

ARTICLE 5.
ACADEMIC PLANS FOR STUDENTS

SECTION 59-18-500. Academic plan for student lacking skills to perform at current grade level; review of results; development of statewide policies.

(A) Beginning in 1998-99 and annually thereafter, at the beginning of each school year, the school must notify the parents of the need for a conference for each student in grades three through eight who lacks the skills to perform at his current grade level based on assessment results, school work, or teacher judgment. At the conference, the student, parent, and appropriate school personnel will discuss the steps needed to ensure student success at the next grade level. An academic plan will be developed to outline additional services the school and district will provide and the actions the student and the parents will undertake to further student success.

(B) The participants in the conference will sign off on the academic plan, including any requirement for summer school attendance. Should a parent, after attempts by the school to schedule the conference at their convenience, not attend the conference, the school will appoint a school mentor, either a teacher or adult volunteer, to work with the student and advocate for services. A copy of the academic plan will be sent to the parents by certified mail.

(C) At the end of the school year, the student's performance will be reviewed by appropriate school personnel. If the student's work has not been at grade level or if the terms of the academic plan have not been met, the student may be retained, he may be required to attend summer school, or he may be required to attend a comprehensive remediation program the following year designed to address objectives outlined in the academic plan for promotion. Students required to participate the following year in a comprehensive remediation program must be considered on academic probation. Comprehensive remediation programs established by the district shall operate outside of the normal school day and must meet the guidelines established for these programs by the State Board of Education. If there is a compelling reason why the student should not be required to attend summer school or be retained, the parent or student may appeal to a district review panel.

(D) At the end of summer school, a district panel must review the student's progress and report to the parents whether the student's academic progress indicates readiness to achieve grade level standards for the next grade. If the student is not at grade level or the student's assessment results show standards are not met, the student must be placed on academic probation. A conference of the student, parents, and appropriate school personnel must revise the academic plan to address academic difficulties. At the conference it must be stipulated that academic probation means if either school work is not up to grade level or if assessment results again show standards are not met, the student will be retained. The district's appeals process remains in effect.

(E) Each district board of trustees will establish policies on academic conferences, individual student academic plans, and district level reviews. Information on these policies must be given to every student and parent. Each district is to monitor the implementation of academic plans as a part of the local accountability plan. Districts are to use Act 135 of 1993 academic assistance funds to carry out academic plans, including required summer school attendance. Districts' policies regarding retention of students in grades one and two remain in effect.

(F) The State Board of Education, working with the Oversight Committee, will establish guidelines until regulations are promulgated to carry out this section. The State Board of Education, working with the Accountability Division, will promulgate regulations requiring the reporting of the number of students retained at each grade level, the number of students on probation, number of students retained after being on probation, and number of students removed from probation. This data will be used as a performance indicator for accountability.

ARTICLE 7. MATERIALS AND ACCREDITATION

SECTION 59-18-700. Alignment of criteria for instructional materials with educational standards.

The criteria governing the adoption of instructional materials shall be revised by the State Board of Education to require that the content of such materials reflect the substance and level of performance outlined in the grade specific educational standards adopted by the state board.

SECTION 59-18-710. Criteria for state's accreditation system.

By November, 2000, the State Board of Education, working with the Department of Education and recommendations from the Accountability Division, must promulgate regulations outlining the criteria for the state's accreditation system which must include student academic performance.

ARTICLE 9. REPORTING

SECTION 59-18-900. Development of annual report card for each school; academic performance ratings; contents; progress narrative written by school.

(A) The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education, is directed to establish an annual report card and its format to report on the performance for the individual elementary, middle, high schools, and school districts of the State. The school's ratings on

academic performance must be emphasized and an explanation of their significance for the school and the district must also be reported. The annual report card must serve at least four purposes:

- (1) inform parents and the public about the school's performance;
- (2) assist in addressing the strengths and weaknesses within a particular school;
- (3) recognize schools with high performance; and
- (4) evaluate and focus resources on schools with low performance.

(B) The Oversight Committee shall determine the criteria for and establish five academic performance ratings of excellent, good, average, below average, and unsatisfactory. Schools and districts shall receive a rating for absolute and improvement performance. Only the scores of students enrolled in the school at the time of the forty-five-day enrollment count shall be used to determine the absolute and improvement ratings. The Oversight Committee shall establish student performance indicators which will be those considered to be useful for assessing a school's overall performance and appropriate for the grade levels within the school.

(C) In setting the criteria for the academic performance ratings and the performance indicators, the Education Oversight Committee shall report the performance by subgroups of students in the school and schools similar in student characteristics. Criteria must use established guidelines for statistical analysis and build on current data-reporting practices.

(D) The report card must include a comprehensive set of performance indicators with information on comparisons, trends, needs, and performance over time which is helpful to parents and the public in evaluating the school. Special efforts are to be made to ensure that the information contained in the report cards is provided in an easily understood manner and a reader friendly format. This information should also provide a context for the performance of the school. Where appropriate, the data should yield disaggregated results to schools and districts in planning for improvement. The report card should include information in such areas as programs and curriculum, school leadership, community and parent support, faculty qualifications, evaluations of the school by parents, teachers, and students. In addition, the report card must contain other criteria including, but not limited to, information on promotion and retention ratios, disciplinary climate, dropout ratios, dropout reduction, student and teacher ratios, and attendance data.

(E) The principal, in conjunction with the School Improvement Council established in Section 59-20-60, must write an annual narrative of a school's progress in order to further inform parents and the community about the school and its operation. The narrative must cite factors or activities supporting progress and barriers which inhibit progress. The school's report card must be furnished to parents and the public no later than November fifteenth.

(F) The percentage of new trustees who have completed the orientation requirement provided in Section 59-19-45 must be reflected on the school district report card.

(G) The State Board of Education shall promulgate regulations outlining the procedures for data collection, data accuracy, data reporting, and consequences for failure to provide data required in this section.

SECTION 59-18-910. Progress reports.

No later than June 1, 1999, the Accountability Division must report on the development of the performance indicators criteria and the report card to the Education Oversight Committee and the State Board of Education. A second report, to include uniform collection procedures for

academic standards and performance indicators, is due by September 1, 1999. No later than September, 1999, the State Department of Education shall report to the Oversight Committee the determination of the levels of difficulty for the assessments by grade and academic area. By March 1, 2000, a report on the development of baseline data for the schools is due from the division.

SECTION 59-18-920. Report card requirements for charter, alternative and vocational schools.

A charter school established pursuant to Chapter 40, Title 59 shall report the data requested by the Department of Education necessary to generate a report card. The Department of Education shall utilize this data to issue a report card with performance ratings to parents and the public containing the ratings and explaining its significance and providing other information similar to that required of other schools in this section. The performance of students attending charter schools sponsored by the South Carolina Public Charter School District must be included in the overall performance ratings of the South Carolina Public Charter School District. The performance of students attending a charter school authorized by a local school district must be reflected on a separate line on the school district's report card and must not be included in the overall performance ratings of the local school district. An alternative school is included in the requirements of this chapter; however, the purpose of an alternative school must be taken into consideration in determining its performance rating. The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education and the School to Work Advisory Council, shall develop a report card for career and technology schools.

SECTION 59-18-930. Report cards; date for issuance; advertisement of results.

Beginning in 2001 and annually thereafter the State Department of Education must issue report cards to all schools and districts of the State no later than November first. The report card must be mailed to all parents of the school and the school district. The school, in conjunction with the district board, must also inform the community of the school's report card by advertising the results in at least one South Carolina daily newspaper of general circulation in the area. This notice must be published within ninety days of receipt of the report cards issued by the State Department of Education and must be a minimum of two columns by ten inches (four and one-half by ten inches) with at least a twenty-four point bold headline.

ARTICLE 11.
AWARDING PERFORMANCE

SECTION 59-18-1100. Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program established; criteria; eligibility of schools for academically talented.

The State Board of Education, working with the division and the Department of Education, must establish the Palmetto Gold and Silver Awards Program to recognize and reward schools for academic achievement. Awards will be established for schools attaining high levels of absolute performance and for schools attaining high rates of improvement. The award program must base improved performance on longitudinally matched student data and may include such additional criteria as:

- (1) student attendance;
 - (2) teacher attendance;
 - (3) student dropout rates; and
 - (4) any other factors promoting or maintaining high levels of achievement and performance.
- Schools shall be rewarded according to specific criteria established by the division. In defining eligibility for a reward for high levels of performance, student performance should exceed

expected levels of improvement. The State Board of Education shall promulgate regulations to ensure districts of the State utilize these funds to improve or maintain exceptional performance according to their school's plans established in Section 59-139-10. Funds may be utilized for professional development support.

Special schools for the academically talented are not eligible to receive an award pursuant to the provisions of this section unless they have demonstrated improvement and high absolute achievement for three years immediately preceding.

SECTION 59-18-1110. Grant of flexibility of receiving exemption from regulations; criteria; continuation of and removal from flexibility status.

(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a school is given the flexibility of receiving exemptions from those regulations and statutory provisions governing the defined program provided that, during a three-year period, the following criteria are satisfied:

(1) the school has twice been a recipient of a Palmetto Gold or Silver Award, pursuant to Section 59-18-1100;

(2) the school has met annual improvement standards for subgroups of students in reading and mathematics; and

(3) the school has exhibited no recurring accreditation deficiencies.

(B) Schools receiving flexibility status are released from those regulations and statutory provisions referred to above including, but not limited to, regulations and statutory provisions on class scheduling, class structure, and staffing. The State Board of Education in consultation with the Education Oversight Committee must promulgate regulations and develop guidelines for providing this flexibility by December 1, 2001.

(C) To continue to receive flexibility pursuant to this section, a school must annually exhibit school improvement at or above the state average as computed in the school recognition program pursuant to Section 59-18-1100 and must meet the gains required for subgroups of students in reading and mathematics. A school which does not requalify for flexibility status due to extenuating circumstances may apply to the State Board of Education for an extension of this status for one year.

(D) In the event that a school is removed from flexibility status, the school is not subject to regulations and statutory provisions exempted under this section until the beginning of the school year following notification of the change in status by the State Department of Education. Subsequent monitoring by the State Department of Education in a school that is removed from flexibility status shall not include a review of program records exempted under this section for the period that the school has received flexibility status or for the school year during which the school was notified of its removal from flexibility status.

SECTION 59-18-1120. Grant of flexibility of exemption from regulations and statutes to school designated as unsatisfactory while in such status; extension to other schools.

(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a school designated as unsatisfactory while in such status is given the flexibility of receiving exemptions from those regulations and statutory provisions governing the defined program or other State Board of Education regulations, dealing with the core academic areas as outlined in Section 59-18-120, provided that the review team recommends such flexibility to the State Board of Education.

(B) Other schools may receive flexibility when their strategic plan explains why such exemptions are expected to improve the academic performance of the students and the plan meets the approval by the State Board of Education. To continue to receive flexibility pursuant to this section, a school must annually exhibit overall school improvement as outlined in its revised plan and must meet the gains set for subgroups of students in reading and mathematics. A school which does not requalify for flexibility status due to extenuating circumstances may apply to the State Board of Education for an extension of this status for one year according to the provisions of Section 59-18-1110(D).

ARTICLE 13. DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS

SECTION 59-18-1300. District accountability system; development and review.

The State Board of Education, based on recommendations of the division, must develop regulations requiring that no later than August, 1999, each district board of trustees must establish and annually review a performance based accountability system, or modify its existing accountability system, to reinforce the state accountability system. Parents, teachers, and principals must be involved in the development, annual review, and revisions of the accountability system established by the district. The board of trustees shall ensure that a district accountability plan be developed, reviewed, and revised annually. In order to stimulate constant improvement in the process of teaching and learning in each school and to target additional local assistance for a school when its students' performance is low or shows little improvement, the district accountability system must build on the district and school activities and plans required in Section 59-139-10. In keeping with the emphasis on school accountability, principals should be actively involved in the selection, discipline, and dismissal of personnel in their particular school. The date the school improvement reports must be provided to parents is changed to February first. Until such time as regulations pursuant to this section become effective, school district accountability systems must be developed, adopted, and implemented in accordance with State Board of Education guidelines.

The Department of Education shall offer technical support to any district requesting assistance in the development of an accountability plan. Furthermore, the department must conduct a review of accountability plans as part of the peer review process required in Section 59-139-10(H) to ensure strategies are contained in the plans that shall maximize student learning. The department shall submit plans for the peer review process to the division for approval by August, 1999. School districts not having an approved plan by August 1, 1999, shall be provided a plan by the department within ninety days.

SECTION 59-18-1310. Consolidation of strategic plans and improvement reports; submission dates.

The strategic plans and improvement reports required of the public schools and districts in Sections 59-18-1300, 59-18-1500, and 59-20-60 are consolidated and reported as follows: district and school five-year plans and annual updates and district programmatic reports, and school reports developed in conjunction with the school improvement council to parents and constituents to include recommendations of any Education Accountability Act external review teams as approved by the State Board of Education and the steps being taken to address the recommendations, and the advertisement of this report are due on a date established by the Department of Education, but no later than April thirtieth annually; schools reviewed by external review teams shall prepare a report to the parents and constituents of the school, to be developed in conjunction with the School Improvement Council, and this report shall be

provided and advertised no later than April thirtieth annually. The school report card narrative in Section 59-18-900 continues on its prescribed date.

ARTICLE 15. INTERVENTION AND ASSISTANCE

SECTION 59-18-1500. Schools rated below average or unsatisfactory; review and revision of improvement plan; notice to parents; publication in newspaper; grant program eligibility.

(A) When a school receives a rating of below average or unsatisfactory, the following actions must be undertaken by the school, the district, and the board of trustees:

(1) The faculty of the school with the leadership of the principal must review its improvement plan and revise it with the assistance of the school improvement council established in Section 59-20-60. The revised plan should look at every aspect of schooling, and must outline activities that, when implemented, can reasonably be expected to improve student performance and increase the rate of student progress. The plan should provide a clear, coherent plan for professional development, which has been designed by the faculty, that is ongoing, job related, and keyed to improving teaching and learning. A time line for implementation of the activities and the goals to be achieved must be included.

(2) Once the revised plan is developed, the district superintendent and the local board of trustees shall review the school's strategic plan to determine if the plan focuses on strategies to increase student academic performance. Once the district board has approved the plan, it must delineate the strategies and support the district will give the plan.

(3) After the approval of the revised plan, the principals' and teachers' professional growth plans, as required by Section 59-26-40 and Section 59-24-40, should be reviewed and amended to reflect the professional development needs identified in the revised plan and must establish individual improvement criteria on the performance dimensions for the next evaluation.

(4) The school, in conjunction with the district board, must inform the parents of children attending the school of the ratings received from the State Board of Education and must outline the steps in the revised plan to improve performance, including the support which the board of trustees has agreed to give the plan. This information must go to the parents no later than February first. This information must also be advertised in at least one South Carolina daily newspaper of general circulation in the area. This notice must be published within ninety days of receipt of the report cards issued by the State Department of Education and must be a minimum of two columns by ten inches (four and one-half by ten inches) with at least a twenty-four point bold headline. The notice must include the following information: name of school district, name of superintendent, district office telephone number, name of school, name of principal, telephone number of school, school's absolute performance rating and improvement performance rating on student academic performance, and strategies which must be taken by the district and school to improve student performance; and

(5) Upon a review of the revised plan to ensure it contains sufficiently high standards and expectations for improvement, the Department of Education is to delineate the activities, support, services, and technical assistance it will make available to support the school's plan and sustain improvement over time. Schools meeting the criteria established pursuant to Section 59-18-1560 will be eligible for the grant programs created by that section.

SECTION 59-18-1510. Assignment of external review committee; activities and recommendations.

(A) When a school receives a rating of unsatisfactory or upon the request of a school rated below average, an external review team must be assigned by the Department of Education to

examine school and district educational programs, actions, and activities. The Education Oversight Committee, in consultation with the State Department of Education, shall develop the criteria for the identification of persons to serve as members of an external review team which shall include representatives from selected school districts, respected retired educators, State Department of Education staff, higher education representatives, parents from the district, and business representatives.

(B) The activities of the external review committee may include:

- (1) examine all facets of school operations, focusing on strengths and weaknesses, determining the extent to which the instructional program is aligned with the content standards, and recommendations which draw upon strategies from those who have been successful in raising academic achievement in schools with similar student characteristics;
- (2) consult with parents, community members, and members of the School Improvement Council to gather additional information on the strengths and weaknesses of the school;
- (3) identify personnel changes, if any, that are needed at the school and/or district level and discuss such findings with the board;
- (4) work with school staff, central offices, and local boards of trustees in the design of the school's plan, implementation strategies, and professional development training that can reasonably be expected to improve student performance and increase the rate of student progress in that school;
- (5) identify needed support from the district, the State Department of Education, and other sources for targeted long-term technical assistance;
- (6) report its recommendations, no later than three months after the school receives the designation of unsatisfactory to the school, the district board of trustees, and the State Board of Education; and
- (7) report annually to the local board of trustees and state board over the next four years, or as deemed necessary by the state board, on the district's and school's progress in implementing the plans and recommendations and in improving student performance.

(C) Within thirty days, the Department of Education must notify the principal, the superintendent, and the district board of trustees of the recommendations approved by the State Board of Education. After the approval of the recommendations, the department shall delineate the activities, support, services, and technical assistance it will provide to the school. With the approval of the state board, this assistance will continue for at least three years, or as determined to be needed by the review committee to sustain improvement.

SECTION 59-18-1520. Declaration of state of emergency in school rated below average.

If the recommendations approved by the state board, the district's plan, or the school's revised plan is not satisfactorily implemented by the school rated unsatisfactory and its school district according to the time line developed by the State Board of Education or if student academic performance has not met expected progress, the principal, district superintendent, and members of the board of trustees must appear before the State Board of Education to outline the reasons why a state of emergency should not be declared in the school. The state superintendent, after consulting with the external review committee and with the approval of the State Board of Education, shall be granted the authority to take any of the following actions:

- (1) furnish continuing advice and technical assistance in implementing the recommendations of the State Board of Education;
- (2) declare a state of emergency in the school and replace the school's principal; or
- (3) declare a state of emergency in the school and assume management of the school.

SECTION 59-18-1530. Teacher and principal specialists; recruitment, eligibility, duties, and incentives.

(A) Teacher specialists on site must be assigned in any of the four core academic areas to a middle or high school in an impaired district or designated as below average or unsatisfactory, if the review team so recommends and recommendation is approved by the State Board of Education. Teacher specialists on site must be assigned at a rate of one teacher for each grade level with a maximum of five to elementary schools in impaired districts or designated as below average or unsatisfactory. The Department of Education, in consultation with the Division of Accountability, shall develop a program for the identification, selection, and training of teachers with a history of exemplary student academic achievement to serve as teacher specialists on site. Retired educators may be considered for specialists.

(B) In order to sustain improvement and help implement the review team's recommendations, the specialists will teach and work with the school faculty on a regular basis throughout the school year for up to three years, or as recommended by the review committee and approved by the state board. Teacher specialists must teach a minimum of three hours per day on average in team teaching or teaching classes. Teacher specialists shall not be assigned administrative duties or other responsibilities outside the scope of this section. The specialists will assist the school in gaining knowledge of best practices and well-validated alternatives, demonstrate effective teaching, act as coach for improving classroom practices, give support and training to identify needed changes in classroom instructional strategies based upon analyses of assessment data, and support teachers in acquiring new skills. School districts are asked to cooperate in releasing employees for full-time or part-time employment as a teacher specialist.

(C) To encourage and recruit teachers for assignment to below standard and unsatisfactory schools, those assigned to such schools will receive their salary and a supplement equal to fifty percent of the current southeastern average teacher salary as projected by the State Budget and Control Board, Office of Research and Analysis. The salary and supplement is to be paid by the State for three years.

(D) In order to attract a pool of qualified applicants to work in low-performing schools, the Education Oversight Committee, in consultation with the Leadership Academy of the South Carolina Department of Education, shall develop criteria for the identification, selection, and training of principals with a history of exemplary student academic achievement. Retired educators may be considered for principal specialists. A principal specialist may be hired for a school designated as unsatisfactory, if the district board of trustees chooses to replace the principal of that school. The principal specialist will assist the school in gaining knowledge of best practices and well-validated alternatives in carrying out the recommendations of the review team. The specialist will demonstrate effective leadership for improving classroom practices, assist in the analyses of assessment data, work with individual members of the faculty emphasizing needed changes in classroom instructional strategies based upon analyses of assessment data, and support teachers in acquiring new skills designed to increase academic performance. School districts are asked to cooperate in releasing employees for full-time or part-time employment as a principal specialist.

(E) In order to attract a pool of qualified principals to work in low-performing schools, the principal specialists hired in such schools will receive their salary and a supplement equal to 1.25 times the supplement amount calculated for teachers. The salary and supplement are to be paid by the State for two years.

(F) The supplements are to be considered part of the regular salary base for which retirement contributions are deductible by the South Carolina Retirement System pursuant to Section 9-1-1020. Principal and teacher specialists on site who are assigned to below average and unsatisfactory schools shall be allowed to return to employment with their previous district at the end of the contract period with the same teaching or administrative contract status as when they left but without assurance as to the school or supplemental position to which they may be assigned.

(G) For retired educators drawing benefits from the state retirement system who are serving in the capacity of principal or teacher specialist on site, the earnings limitations which restrict the amount of compensation that may be earned from covered employment while drawing benefits under the state retirement system do not apply to any compensation paid to them as an on-site specialist not to exceed one year of such employment whether they are working directly for the school district or for some entity in this capacity. However, no further contributions may be made to the state retirement system related to this compensation and no additional retirement benefits or credits may be received or accrued.

(H) Within the parameters herein, the school district will have final determination on individuals who are assigned as teacher specialists and principal specialists.

SECTION 59-18-1540. Mentoring program for principals.

Each principal continued in employment in schools in districts designated as impaired or in schools designated as below average or unsatisfactory must participate in a formal mentoring program with a principal. The Department of Education, working with the Education Oversight Committee, shall design the mentoring program and provide a stipend to those principals serving as mentors.

SECTION 59-18-1550. Recertification credits for teachers participating in professional development activities and improvement actions.

Each teacher employed in schools designated as below average or unsatisfactory who participate in the professional development activities and the improvement actions of the school which go beyond the normal school day and year may earn credits toward recertification according to the criteria established by the State Board of Education. To receive credit, activities must be based on identified professional development needs outlined in the school's improvement plan and must include at least one of the following:

- (1) summer institute with follow-up activities;
- (2) practice of new teaching strategies with peers regularly throughout the school year;
- (3) work with peer study groups during the academic year in planning lessons; and
- (4) observing and coaching regularly in one another's classrooms.

The activities must be approved by the Department of Education and the department shall determine the amount of credit earned by the participation.

SECTION 59-18-1560. Grant programs for schools designated as below average or unsatisfactory; development of eligibility guidelines; funding.

(A) The State Board of Education, working with the Accountability Division and the Department of Education, must establish grant programs for schools designated as below average and for schools designated as unsatisfactory. A school designated as below average will qualify for a

grant to undertake any needed retraining of school faculty and administration once the revised plan is determined by the State Department of Education to meet the criteria on high standards and effective activities. A school designated as unsatisfactory will qualify for the grant program after the State Board of Education approves its revised plan. A grant or a portion of a grant may be renewed annually over the next three years, if school and district actions to implement the revised plan continue. Should student performance not improve, any revisions to the plan must meet high standards prior to renewal of the grant. The revised plan must be reviewed by the district and board of trustees and the State Department of Education to determine what other actions, if any, need to be taken. A grant may be extended for up to an additional two years, if the State Board of Education determines it is needed to sustain academic improvement. The funds must be expended based on the revised plan and according to criteria established by the State Board of Education. Prior to extending any grant, the Accountability Division shall review school expenditures to make a determination of the effective use of previously awarded grant funds. If deficient use is determined, those deficiencies must be identified, noted, and corrective action taken before a grant extension will be given.

(B) The State Board of Education, working with the Department of Education and with the approval of the Education Oversight Committee, will develop guidelines outlining eligibility for the grant programs and methods of distributing funds which will be in effect until such time as the school ratings in Section 59-18-900(B) are implemented. In developing the eligibility guidelines, the board should consider criteria similar to that used in the former impaired district program. Until such time as regulations are promulgated, the funds shall be distributed on a per teacher basis for use only as outlined in the revised school plan.

(C) A public school assistance fund shall be established as a separate fund within the state general fund for the purpose of providing financial support to assist poorly performing schools. The fund may consist of grants, gifts, and donations from any public or private source or monies that may be appropriated by the General Assembly for this purpose. Income from the fund shall be retained in the fund. All funds may be carried forward from fiscal year to fiscal year. The State Treasurer shall invest the monies in this fund in the same manner as other funds under his control are invested. The State Board of Education, in consultation with the commission, shall administer and authorize any disbursements from the fund. The State Board of Education shall promulgate regulations to implement the provisions of this section.

SECTION 59-18-1570. School district rated below average; appointment of external review committee; duties; recommendations; composition.

(A) When a district receives a rating of below average, the State Superintendent, with the approval of the State Board of Education, shall appoint an external review committee to study educational programs in that district and identify factors affecting the performance of the district. The review committee must:

- (1) examine all facets of school and district operations, focusing on strengths and weaknesses, determining the extent to which the instructional program is aligned with the content standards and shall make recommendations which draw upon strategies from those who have been successful in raising academic achievement in schools with similar student characteristics;
- (2) consult with parents and community members to gather additional information on the strengths and weaknesses of the district;
- (3) identify personnel changes, if any, that are needed at the school and/or district level and discuss such findings with the board;
- (4) work with school staff, central offices, and local boards of trustees in the design of the district's plan, implementation strategies, and professional development training that can

reasonably be expected to improve student performance and increase the rate of student progress in the district;

(5) identify needed support from the State Department of Education and other sources for targeted long-term technical assistance;

(6) report its recommendations, no later than three months after the district receives the designation of unsatisfactory, to the superintendent, the district board of trustees, and the State Board of Education; and

(7) report annually over the next four years to the local board of trustees and state board, or as deemed necessary by the state board, on the district's and school's progress in implementing the plans and recommendations and in improving student performance.

(B) Within thirty days, the Department of Education must notify the superintendent and the district board of trustees of the recommendations approved by the State Board of Education. Upon the approval of the recommendations, the Department of Education must delineate the activities, support, services, and technical assistance it will provide to support the recommendations and sustain improvement over time. The external review committee must report annually to the local board of trustees and the state board over the next four years, or as deemed necessary by the state board, on the district's progress in implementing the recommendations and improving student performance.

(C) The review committee shall be composed of State Department of Education staff, representatives from selected school districts, higher education, and business.

SECTION 59-18-1580. Declaration of state of emergency in school district rated below average.

If recommendations approved by the State Board of Education are not satisfactorily implemented by the school district according to the time line developed by the State Board of Education, or if student performance has not made the expected progress and the school district is designated as unsatisfactory, the district superintendent and members of the board of trustees must appear before the State Board of Education to outline the reasons why a state of emergency should not be declared in the district. The state superintendent, with the approval of the State Board of Education, is granted authority to do any of the following:

(1) furnish continuing advice and technical assistance in implementing the recommendations of the State Board of Education;

(2) recommend to the Governor that the office of superintendent be declared vacant. If the Governor declares the office vacant, the state superintendent may furnish an interim replacement until the vacancy is filled by the board of trustees or until an election is held as provided by law to fill the vacancy if the superintendent who is replaced is elected to such office. Local boards of trustees negotiating contracts for the superintendency shall include a provision that the contract is void should the Governor declare that office of superintendency vacant pursuant to this section. This contract provision does not apply to any existing contracts but to new contracts or renewal of contracts;

(3) declare a state of emergency in the school district and assume management of the school district.

SECTION 59-18-1590. Continuing review of instructional and organizational practices and delivery of technical assistance by Department of Education.

To assist schools and school districts as they work to improve classroom practice and student performance, the Department of Education must increase the delivery of quality technical assistance services and the assessment of instructional programs. The department may need to

reshape some of its organization and key functions to make them more consistent with the assistance required by schools and districts in developing and implementing local accountability systems and meeting state standards. The Department of Education must:

- (1) establish an ongoing state mechanism to promote successful programs found in South Carolina schools for implementation in schools with similar needs and students, to review evidence on instructional and organizational practices considered to be effective, and to alert schools and classroom teachers to these options and the sources of training and names of implementing schools;
- (2) provide information and technical assistance in understanding state policies, how they fit together, and the best practice in implementing them; and
- (3) establish a process for monitoring information provided for accountability and for assessing improvement efforts and implementation of state laws and policies which focuses on meeting the intent and purpose of those laws and policies.

SECTION 59-18-1595. Reallocation of technical assistance funding.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in order to provide assistance at the beginning of the school year, schools may qualify for technical assistance based on the criteria established by the Education Oversight Committee for school ratings and on the most recently available end-of-year assessment scores. In order to best meet the needs of low-performing schools, the funding provided for technical assistance under the Education Accountability Act may be reallocated among the programs and purposes specified in this section. The State Department of Education shall establish criteria for reviewing and assisting schools that will be rated unsatisfactory using a tiered system with the lowest-performing schools receiving highest priority. Not to exceed the statewide total number of specialists stipulated by the Education Accountability Act, the highest priority school assistance shall include a year-long technical assistance team that may include a lead principal or curriculum specialist, or both. All specialists shall have a demonstrated record of success in their field and shall be entitled to the incentives and benefits of a teacher specialist. Technical assistance for below average schools shall be provided to the extent possible in order of need. The State Department of Education shall provide information on the technical assistance strategies and their impact to the State Board of Education, the Education Oversight Committee, the Senate Education Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, the House of Representatives Education and Public Works Committee, and the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee annually

ARTICLE 17.
PUBLIC INFORMATION

SECTION 59-18-1700. Public information campaign; development and approval; funding.

(A) An on-going public information campaign must be established to apprise the public of the status of the public schools and the importance of high standards for academic performance for the public school students of South Carolina. A special committee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Education Oversight Committee to include two committee members representing business and two representing education and others representing business, industry, and education. The committee shall plan and oversee the development of a campaign, including public service announcements for the media and other such avenues as deemed appropriate for informing the public. The plan must be reported to the Governor, the Senate Education Committee, and the House Education and Public Works Committee by March 15, 1999.

(B) A separate fund within the state general fund will be established to accept grants, gifts, and donations from any public or private source or monies that may be appropriated by the General Assembly for the public information campaign. Members of the Oversight Committee representing business will solicit donations for this fund. Income from the fund shall be retained in the fund. All funds may be carried forward from fiscal year to fiscal year. The State Treasurer shall invest the monies in this fund in the same manner as other funds under his control are invested. The Oversight Committee shall administer and authorize any disbursements from the fund. Private individuals and groups shall be encouraged to contribute to this endeavor.

ARTICLE 19. MISCELLANEOUS

SECTION 59-18-1910. Homework centers.

The State Board of Education shall establish grant programs to fund homework centers in schools and districts designated as below average and unsatisfactory. Until such time as these ratings are established, all schools in districts declared to be impaired are eligible to receive funding on a per pupil basis. Schools receiving such designations must provide centers that go beyond the regular school hours where students can come and receive assistance in understanding and completing their school work. Funds provided for these centers may be used for salaries for certified teachers and for transportation costs. Homework centers meeting the criteria established by the board shall receive funds as appropriated by the General Assembly. For 1998-99, of the funds appropriated for assessment, up to five hundred thousand dollars shall be used for homework centers.

SECTION 59-18-1920. Modified school year or school day schedule; grant program established; application; implementation plan.

(A) The State Board of Education, through the Department of Education, shall establish a grant program to encourage school districts to pilot test or implement a modified school year or school day schedule. The purpose of the grant is to assist with the additional costs incurred during the intersessions for salaries, transportation, and operations, or for additional costs incurred by lengthening the school day. For a district to qualify for a grant, all the schools within a specific feeder zone or elementary-to-middle-to-high-school attendance area, must be pilot testing or implementing the modified year or day schedule. Districts declared to be impaired will have priority in obtaining such grants.

(B) To obtain a grant, a district shall submit an application to the state board in a format specified by the Department of Education. The application shall include a plan for implementing a modified year or day that provides the following: more time for student learning, learning opportunities that typically are not available in the regular student day, targeted assistance for students whose academic performance is significantly below promotion standards, more efficient use of facilities and other resources, and evaluations of the impact of the modified schedule. Local district boards of trustees shall require students whose performance in a core subject area, as defined in Section 59-18-300, is the equivalent of a "D" average or below to attend the intersessions or stay for the lengthened day and receive special assistance in the subject area. Funding for the program is as provided by the General Assembly in the annual appropriations act. Each grant award for program pilot testing or implementation may not exceed a three-year period.

SECTION 59-18-1930. Review of state and local professional development; recommendations for improvement.

The Education Oversight Committee shall provide for a comprehensive review of state and local professional development to include principal leadership development and teacher staff development. The review must provide an analysis of training to include what professional development is offered, how it is offered, the support given to implement skills acquired from professional development, and how the professional development enhances the academic goals outlined in district and school strategic plans. The oversight committee shall recommend better ways to provide and meet the needs for professional development, to include the use of the existing five contract days for in service. Needed revisions shall be made to state regulations to promote use of state dollars for training which meets national standards for staff development.

Upon receipt of the recommendations from the comprehensive review of state and local professional development, the State Department of Education shall develop an accountability system to ensure that identified professional development standards are effectively implemented. As part of this system the department shall provide information on the identified standards to all principals and other professional development leaders. Training for all school districts in how to design comprehensive professional development programs that are consistent with the standards shall also be a part of the implementation. A variety of staff development options that address effective teaching and assessment of state academic standards and workforce preparation skills shall be included in the information provided to principals and other professional development leaders to ensure high levels of student achievement.

SECTION 59-24-5. Principal Leadership

The General Assembly finds that the leadership of the principal is key to the success of a school, and support for ongoing, integrated professional development is integral to better schools and to the improvement of the actual work of teachers and school staff.

SECTION 59-24-10. Assessment of principals prior to appointment

Beginning with the school year 1999-2000, any person prior to permanent appointment as a principal for any elementary school, secondary school, or vocational center must be assessed for instructional leadership and management capabilities by the Leadership Academy of the South Carolina Department of Education. Districts may appoint such persons on an interim basis until such time as the assessment is completed. A report of this assessment must be forwarded to the district superintendent and board of trustees. The provisions of this section do not apply to any persons currently employed as principals on the effective date of the provisions of this paragraph nor to any persons hired as principals before the beginning of school year 1999-2000.

SECTION 59-24-30. Administrator professional development plan

All school administrators shall develop an on-going individual professional development plan with annual updates which is appropriate for their role or position. This plan shall support both their individual growth and organizational needs. Organizational needs must be defined by the districts' strategic plans or school renewal plans. Individuals completing the assessment for instructional leadership will develop their professional development plan on the basis of that assessment. The Department of Education shall assist school administrators in carrying out

their professional development plans by reviewing the school and district plans and providing or brokering programs and services in the areas identified for professional development."

SECTION 59-24-50 Standards for continuous professional development programs.

By January 1, 1999, the South Carolina Department of Education's Leadership Academy shall develop, in cooperation with school districts, district consortia, and state-supported institutions of higher education, continuous professional development programs which meet national standards for professional development and focus on the improvement of teaching and learning. By July 1, 1999, programs funded with state funds must meet these standards and must provide training, modeling, and coaching on effective instructional leadership as it pertains to instructional leadership and school-based improvement, including instruction on the importance of school improvement councils and ways administrators may make school improvement councils an active force in school improvement. The training must be developed and conducted in collaboration with the School Council Assistance Project."

SECTION 59-24-80. Induction program for principals

Beginning with school year 1999-2000, each school district, or consortium of school districts, shall provide school principals serving for the first time as the head building administrators with a formalized induction program in cooperation with the State Department of Education. The State Board of Education must develop regulations for the program based on the criteria and statewide performance standards which are a part of the process for assisting, developing, and evaluating principals employed in the school districts. The program must include an emphasis on the elements of instructional leadership skills, implementation of effective schools research, and analysis of test scores for curricular improvement."

SECTION 59-24-15. Contractual rights.

Certified education personnel who are employed as administrators on an annual or multi-year contract will retain their rights as a teacher under the provisions of Article 3 of Chapter 19 and Article 5 of Chapter 25 of this title but no such rights are granted to the position or salary of administrator. Any such administrator who presently is under a contract granting such rights shall retain that status until the expiration of that contract.

SECTION 59-6-10 Establishment of Education Oversight Committee

(A) In order to assist in, recommend, and supervise implementation of programs and expenditure of funds for the Education Accountability Act and the Education Improvement Act of 1984, the Education Oversight Committee is to serve as the oversight committee for these acts. The Education Oversight Committee shall:

- (1) review and monitor the implementation and evaluation of the Education Accountability Act and Education Improvement Act programs and funding;
- (2) make programmatic and funding recommendations to the General Assembly;
- (3) report annually to the General Assembly, State Board of Education, and the public on the progress of the programs;
- (4) recommend Education Accountability Act and EIA program changes to state agencies and other entities as it considers necessary.

Each state agency and entity responsible for implementing the Education Accountability Act and the Education Improvement Act funded programs shall submit to the Education Oversight Committee programs and expenditure reports and budget requests as needed and in a manner prescribed by the Education Oversight Committee.

The committee consists of the following persons:

- (1) Speaker of the House of Representatives or his designee;
- (2) President Pro Tempore of the Senate or his designee;
- (3) Chairman of the Education and Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives or his designee;
- (4) Chairman of the Education Committee of the Senate or his designee;
- (5) Governor or his designee;
- (6) Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives or his designee;
- (7) Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate or his designee;
- (8) Five members representing business and industry who must have experience in business, management, or policy to be appointed as follows: one by the Governor, one by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, one by the Speaker of the House, one by the Chairman of the Senate Education Committee, and one by the Chairman of the House Education and Public Works Committee; and
- (9) Five members representing public education teachers and principals to be appointed as follows: one by the Governor, one by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, one by the Speaker of the House, one by the Chairman of the Senate Education Committee, and one by the Chairman of the House Education and Public Works Committee.

Initial appointment must be made by July 31, 1998, at which time the Governor or his designee shall call the first meeting. At the initial meeting, a chairman elected from the members representing the business and industry appointees and a vice chairman representing the education members shall be elected by a majority vote of the committee. The members appointed pursuant to items (1) through (7) may serve notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8-13-770. Their terms of office on the committee must be coterminous with their terms of office as Governor or members of the General Assembly.

(B) The terms of office of the members of the Education Oversight Committee, except for the legislative members, are four years and until their successors are appointed and qualify except of those first appointed the terms must be staggered as follows:

- (1) initial terms of two years shall be served by the two members of the business and industry community appointed by the chairmen of the Education Committees;
- (2) initial terms of three years shall be served by the members of the education community appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House; and
- (3) all other voting members shall serve initial four-year terms. The terms of chairman and vice chairman shall be two years. At the end of each two-year term, an election must be held for the

chairmanship and vice chairmanship by majority vote of the members attending with quorum present. No member shall serve more than four consecutive years as chairman or vice chairman.

Members of the committee shall meet no less than once a quarter and annually shall submit their findings and recommendations to the General Assembly before March first of each fiscal year. The staff positions of the Select Committee and the people presently in those positions initially shall be transferred to the Education Oversight Committee as administrative staff to carry out its functions."

SECTION 59-6-100. Establishment of Accountability Division

Within the Education Oversight Committee, an Accountability Division must be established to report on the monitoring, development, and implementation of the performance based accountability system and reviewing and evaluating all aspects of the Education Accountability Act and the Education Improvement Act.

The Education Oversight Committee will employ, by a majority vote, for a contract term of three years an executive director for the Accountability Division. The director must be chosen solely on grounds of fitness to perform the duties assigned to him and must possess at least the following qualifications: a demonstrated knowledge of public education, experience in program evaluation, and experience in a responsible managerial capacity. No member of the General Assembly nor anyone who will have been a member for one year previously will be contracted to serve as director. The director will have the authority to employ, with the approval of the subcommittee, professional and support staff as necessary to carry out the duties of the division, which shall be separate from the administrative staff of the Education Oversight Committee.

SECTION 59-6-110. Duties of the Division of Accountability

The division must examine the public education system to ensure that the system and its components and the EIA programs are functioning for the enhancement of student learning. The division will recommend the repeal or modification of statutes, policies, and rules that deter school improvement. The division must provide annually its findings and recommendations in a report to the Education Oversight Committee no later than February first. The division is to conduct in-depth studies on implementation, efficiency, and the effectiveness of academic improvement efforts and:

- (1) monitor and evaluate the implementation of the state standards and assessment;
- (2) oversee the development, establishment, implementation, and maintenance of the accountability system;
- (3) monitor and evaluate the functioning of the public education system and its components, programs, policies, and practices and report annually its findings and recommendations in a report to the commission no later than February first of each year; and
- (4) perform other studies and reviews as required by law.

The responsibilities of the division do not include fiscal audit functions or funding recommendations except as they relate to accountability. It is not a function of this division to draft legislation and neither the director nor any other employee of the division shall urge or oppose any legislation. In the performance of its duties and responsibilities, the division and

staff members are subject to the statutory provisions and penalties regarding confidentiality of records as they apply to students, schools, school districts, the Department of Education, and the Board of Education.

SECTION 59-6-120 Work with the Division of Accountability.

The State Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and the school districts and schools shall work collaboratively with the Division of Accountability to provide information needed to carry out the responsibilities and duties of its office. The Division of Accountability may call on the expertise of the state institutions of higher learning and any other public agencies for carrying out its functions and may coordinate and consult with existing agency and legislative staff."

Task force Parental Involvement Task Force

[Note: Because this action was limited by time, the provision is not codified]

SECTION 10. When parents are involved with their children's education, students achieve more, regardless of socio-economic status, ethnic/racial background, or the parents' education level. The more extensive the parent involvement, the higher level of the student achievement. Therefore, the Education Oversight Committee shall appoint a task force to review current state programs and policies for parent participation in their children's education. The task force is to look for ways to encourage and induce parents to oversee and support student academic performance and behavior that contributes to academic improvement. The membership of the task force should include: public school educators from rural, urban, and suburban schools and districts; parents of public school children; social service representatives; and a juvenile justice representative. The task force must be appointed no later than September 1, 1998, and shall provide its report and recommendations to the Education Oversight Committee by October 15, 1999.

SECTION 59-29-10 Phonics required

The county board of education and the board of trustees for each school district shall see that in every school under their care there shall be taught, as far as practicable, orthography, reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, English grammar and instruction in phonics, the elements of agriculture, the history of the United States and of this State, the principles of the Constitutions of the United States and of this State, morals and good behavior, algebra, physiology and hygiene (especially as to the effects of alcoholic liquors and narcotics upon the human system), English literature, and such other branches as the state board may from time to time direct."

SECTION 59-63-65.Class Size Reduction

School districts which choose to reduce class size to fifteen to one in grades one through three shall be eligible for funding for the reduced pupil-teacher ratios from funds provided by the General Assembly for this purpose. Funding for schools in districts designated as impaired or for schools rated as unsatisfactory on the accountability ratings will receive priority in the distribution of funds. Funding for the impaired district schools and schools ranked unsatisfactory will be allocated based on the average daily membership in grades one through three in those schools for implementing reduced class size of fifteen to one in those grades. Other school districts will receive funding allocated based on free and reduced lunch eligible students. Local match is required for the lower ratio funding based on the Education Finance Act formula.

Boards of trustees of each school district may implement the lower pupil-teacher ratios on a school by school, grade by grade, or class by class basis. District boards of trustees implementing the reduced ratios must establish policies to give priority to reduce the ratios in schools with the highest number of students eligible for the federal free and reduced lunch program, and these students must be given priority in implementing the reduced class size. Unobligated funds from state appropriations which become available to a district during a fiscal year shall be redistributed to fund additional teachers on a prorated basis.

Districts choosing to implement the reduced class size must track the students served in classes with a 15:1 ratio for three years so that the impact of smaller class size can be evaluated. The Department of Education, working with the Accountability Division, will develop a plan for evaluating the impact of this initiative and report to the Education Oversight Committee no later than December 1, 2001. School districts must document the use of these funds to reduce class size and the State Department of Education will conduct audits to confirm appropriate use of class size reduction funding.

As used in this section, 'teacher' refers to an employee possessing a professional certificate issued by the State Department of Education whose full-time responsibility is instruction of students. Pupil-teacher ratio is based on average daily membership.

Portable or other temporary classroom space may be used to meet any facilities needs for reducing class size to fifteen to one, and notwithstanding the provisions of Section 59-144-30, funding derived from the Children's Education Endowment Fund may be used to acquire such portable or temporary facilities."

Repeal

SECTION 13. Sections 59-6-12, 59-18-10, 59-18-11, 59-18-15, 59-18-20, 59-18-25, 59-18-30, and 59-18-31 of the 1976 Code are repealed.

Copy of act to be provided

SECTION 14. The Department of Education must provide a copy of this act to every district superintendent and school principal in this State.

References

SECTION 15. The Code Commissioner is directed to change all references in the Code of Laws to the Select Committee so as to read the Education Oversight Committee.

Time effective

SECTION 16. This act takes effect upon approval by the Governor.

Approved the 10th day of June, 1998.

PROVISOS RELATED TO EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM
General Appropriations Act 2006-2007

SECTION 1 - H63 - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1.48. (SDE: School Districts and Special Schools Flexibility) All school districts and special schools of this State may transfer up to one hundred percent of funds between programs to any instructional program provided the funds are utilized for direct classroom instruction.

The South Carolina Department of Education must establish a procedure for the review of all transfers authorized by this provision. The details of such transfers must be provided to members of the General Assembly upon request. School districts and special schools may carry forward unexpended funds from the prior fiscal year into the current fiscal year to be used for the same purpose. All transfers executed pursuant to this provision must be completed by May first of the current fiscal year. All school districts and special schools of this State may expend funds received from the Children's Education Endowment Fund for school facilities and fixed equipment assistance, for any instructional program. The Education Oversight Committee shall review the utilization of the flexibility provision to determine how it enhances or detracts from the achievement of the goals of the educational accountability system, including the ways in which school districts and the state organize for maximum benefit to classroom instruction, priorities among existing programs and services, and the impact on short, as well as, long-term objectives. The State Department of Education shall provide the reports on the transfers to the Education Oversight Committee for the comprehensive review. This review shall be provided to the members of the General Assembly annually. Any grant or technical assistance funds allocated directly to an individual school may not be reduced or reallocated within the school district and must be expended by the receiving school only according to the guidelines governing the funds.

1.64. (SDE: Prohibit Implementation of ECERS Program) The Department of Education is prohibited from utilizing any appropriated or authorized funds to implement the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scores Program. This prohibition does not apply to the Office of First Steps.

In addition, school districts are prohibited from using revenue from any source, including state, federal, and local funds, to implement the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scores Program.

1.67. (SDE: High School Reading Initiative) The funds appropriated for the High School Reading Initiative are to be used to expand the South Carolina Reading Initiative to the high school level by providing research based targeted assistance in improving and accelerating the reading ability of high school students reading below grade level.

1.75. (SDE: Child Development Education Pilot Program) There is created the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program. This program shall be available for the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 school year on a voluntary basis and shall focus on the developmental and learning support that children must have in order to be ready for school and must incorporate parenting education.

(A) Beginning with the 2006-07 school year and continuing through the 2007-2008 school year, with funds appropriated by the General Assembly, the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program shall first be made available to eligible children from the following eight trial districts in Abbeville County School District et. al. vs. South Carolina: Allendale, Dillon 2, Florence 4, Hampton 2, Jasper, Lee, Marion 7, and Orangeburg 3. With any remaining funds available, the pilot shall be expanded to the remaining plaintiff school districts in Abbeville

County School District et. al. vs. South Carolina. Priority shall be given to implementing the program in the plaintiff districts having proportionally the largest population of underserved at-risk four-year-old children. While participating in the pilot program, Education Improvement Act funding from the four-year-old early childhood program as authorized pursuant to Section 59-139-70 of the 1976 Code may only be used to fund teacher salary supplements and fringe benefits as required by Section 59-20-50. During the implementation of the pilot program, no funds appropriated by the General Assembly for this purpose shall be used to fund services to at-risk four-year-old children residing outside of the trial or plaintiff districts.

The Education Oversight Committee shall conduct an evaluation of the pilot program and shall issue a report to the General Assembly by January 1, 2008. The report shall include a comparative evaluation of children served in the pilot program and children not served in the pilot program. Additionally, based on the evaluation of the pilot program, the Education Oversight Committee shall include recommendations for the creation of and an implementation plan for phasing in the delivery of services to all four-year-old at-risk children in the state.

Unexpended funds from the prior fiscal year for this program shall be carried forward and used by the First Steps to Readiness Board of Trustees to provide services to children zero to three years of age in the districts outlined in section (A).

(B) Each child residing in the pilot districts, who will have attained the age of four years on or before September 1, of the school year, and meets the at-risk criteria is eligible for enrollment in the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program for one year.

The parent of each eligible child may enroll the child in one of the following programs:

(1) a school-year four-year-old kindergarten program delivered by an approved public provider; or

(2) a school-year four-year-old kindergarten program delivered by an approved private provider.

The parent enrolling a child must complete and submit an application to the approved provider of choice. The application must be submitted on forms and must be accompanied by a copy of the child's birth certificate, immunization documentation, and an appropriate free and reduced lunch application form or statement of Medicaid eligibility.

In submitting an application for enrollment, the parent agrees to comply with provider attendance policies during the school year. This shall consist of 6.5 hours of instructional time daily and 180 days per year. Pursuant to program guidelines, noncompliance with attendance policies may result in removal from the program.

No parent is required to pay tuition or fees solely for the purpose of enrolling in or attending the program established under this provision. Nothing in this provision prohibits charging fees for childcare that may be provided outside the times of the instructional day provided in these programs.

(C) Public school providers choosing to participate in the South Carolina Four-Year-Old Child Development Kindergarten Program must submit an application to the Department of Education. Private providers choosing to participate in the South Carolina Four-Year-Old Child Development Kindergarten Program must submit an application to the Office of First Steps. The application must be submitted on the forms prescribed, contain assurances that the provider meets all program criteria set forth in this provision, and will comply with all reporting and assessment requirements.

Providers shall:

(1) comply with all federal and state laws and constitutional provisions prohibiting discrimination on the basis of disability, race, creed, color, gender, national origin, religion, ancestry, or need for special education services;

(2) comply with all state and local health and safety laws and codes;

(3) comply with all state laws that apply regarding criminal background checks for employees and exclude from employment any individual not permitted by state law to work with children;

(4) be accountable for meeting the education needs of the child and report regularly to the parent on his progress;

(5) comply with all program, reporting, and assessment criteria required of providers;

(6) maintain individual student records for each child enrolled in the program to include, but not be limited to, assessment data, health data, records of teacher observations, and records of parent and teacher conferences;

(7) designate whether extended day services will be offered to the parents of children participating in the program; and

(8) be approved, registered, or licensed by the Department of Social Services.

Providers may limit student enrollment based upon space available. However if enrollment exceeds available space, providers shall enroll children with first priority given to children with the lowest scores on an approved pre-kindergarten readiness assessment. Private providers shall not be required to expand their programs to accommodate all children desiring enrollment.

(D) The Department of Education and the Office of First Steps to School Readiness, in consultation with the Education Oversight Committee shall:

(1) develop the provider application form;

(2) develop the child enrollment application form;

(3) develop a list of approved curricula for use in the program based upon the South Carolina Content Standards;

(4) develop a list of approved pre-kindergarten readiness assessments to be used in conjunction with the program;

(5) establish criteria for awarding new classroom equipping grants;

(6) establish criteria for the parenting education program providers must offer; and

(7) establish a list of early childhood related fields that may be used in meeting the lead teacher qualifications.

(E) Providers of the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program shall offer a complete educational program in accordance with age-appropriate instructional practice and a research based preschool curriculum aligned with school success. The program must focus on the developmental and learning support children must have in order to be ready for school. The provider must also incorporate parenting education that promotes the school readiness of preschool children by strengthening parent involvement in the learning process with an emphasis on interactive literacy.

Providers shall offer high-quality, center-based programs that must include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

(1) employ a lead teacher with a two-year degree in early childhood education or related field or be granted a waiver of this requirement from the Department of Education or the Office of First Steps to School Readiness;

(2) employ an education assistant with pre-service or in-service training in early childhood education;

(3) maintain classrooms with at least 10 four-year-old children, but no more than 20 four-year-old children with an adult to child ratio of 1:10. With classrooms having a minimum of 10 children, the 1:10 ratio must be a lead teacher to child ratio;

(4) offer a full day, center-based program with 6.5 hours of instruction daily for 180 school days;

(5) provide an approved research-based preschool curriculum that focuses on critical child development skills, especially early literacy, numeracy, and social/emotional development;

(6) engage parents' participation in their child's educational experience that shall include a minimum of two documented conferences per year; and

(7) adhere to professional development requirements outlined in this article.

(F) Every classroom providing services to four-year-old children established pursuant to this provision must have a lead teacher with at least a two-year degree in early childhood education or related field and who is enrolled and is demonstrating progress toward the completion of a teacher education program within four years. Every classroom must also have at least one education assistant per classroom who shall have the minimum of a high school diploma or the equivalent, and at least two years of experience working with children under five years old. The teaching assistant shall have completed the Early Childhood Development Credential (ECD) 101 or enroll and complete this course within twelve months of hire.

(G) The General Assembly recognizes there is a strong relationship between the skills and preparation of pre-kindergarten instructors and the educational outcomes of students. To improve these education outcomes, participating providers shall require all personnel providing instruction and classroom support to students participating in the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program to participate annually in a minimum of 15 hours of professional development to include teaching children from poverty. Professional development should provide instruction in strategies and techniques to address the age-appropriate progress of pre-kindergarten students in developing emergent literacy skills, including but not limited to, oral communication, knowledge of print and letters, phonemic and phonological awareness, and vocabulary and comprehension development.

(H) Both public and private providers shall be eligible for transportation funds for the transportation of children to and from school. Nothing within this provision prohibits providers from contracting with another entity to provide transportation services provided the entities adhere to the requirements of Section 56-5-195. Providers shall not be responsible for transporting students attending programs outside the district lines. Parents choosing program providers located outside of their resident district shall be responsible for transportation. When transporting four-year-old child development students, providers shall make every effort to transport them with students of similar ages attending the same school.

(I) For all private providers approved to offer services pursuant to this provision, the Office of First Steps to School Readiness shall:

(1) serve as the fiscal agent;

(2) verify student enrollment eligibility in consultation with the Department of Social Services;

(3) review and approve eligible providers. In considering approval of providers, consideration must be given to the provider's availability of permanent space for program service and whether temporary classroom space is necessary to provide services to any children;

(4) coordinate oversight, monitoring, technical assistance, coordination, and training for classroom providers;

(5) serve as a clearing house for information and best practices related to four-year-old kindergarten programs;

(6) receive, review, and approve new classroom grant applications and make recommendations for approval based on approved criteria;

(7) coordinate activities and promote collaboration with other private and public providers in developing and supporting four-year-old kindergarten programs;

(8) maintain a database of the children enrolled in the program; and

(9) promulgate guidelines as necessary for the implementation of the pilot program.

(J) For all public school providers approved to offer services pursuant to this provision, the Department of Education shall:

(1) serve as the fiscal agent;

(2) verify student enrollment eligibility in consultation with the Department of Social Services;

(3) review and approve eligible providers. In considering approval of providers, consideration must be given to the provider's availability of permanent space for program service and whether temporary classroom space is necessary to provide services to any children;

(4) coordinate oversight, monitoring, technical assistance, coordination, and training for classroom providers;

(5) serve as a clearing house for information and best practices related to four-year-old kindergarten programs;

(6) receive, review, and approve new classroom grant applications and make recommendations for approval based on approved criteria;

(7) coordinate activities and promote collaboration with other private and public providers in developing and supporting four-year-old kindergarten programs;

(8) maintain a database of the children enrolled in the program; and

(9) promulgate guidelines as necessary for the implementation of the pilot program.

(K) The General Assembly shall provide funding for the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program. For the 2006-07 school year, the funded cost per child shall be \$3,077. Additionally, a reimbursement rate of \$185 per child will be appropriated to providers if the provider transports children to and from school. Providers who are reimbursed are required to retain records as required by their fiscal agent. For the 2007-2008 school year the funded cost per child shall be the same but shall be increased by the same projected rate of inflation as determined by the Division of Research and Statistics of the Budget and Control Board for the Education Finance Act.

With funds appropriated by the General Assembly, the Department of Education shall approve grants for public providers and the Office of First Steps to School Readiness shall approve grants for private providers, of up to \$10,000 per class for the equipping of new classrooms.

(L) Pursuant to this provision, the Department of Social Services shall:

(1) aid the Department of Education and the Office of First Steps to School Readiness in the verification of student enrollment eligibility;

(2) maintain a list of all approved public and private providers; and

(3) provide the Department of Education, the Office of First Steps, and the Education Oversight Committee information necessary to carry out the requirements of this provision.

(M) The Education Oversight Committee shall conduct a comparative evaluation of the South Carolina Child Development Education Pilot Program and issue their findings in a report to the General Assembly by January 1, 2008. Based on information, data, and evaluation results, the Education Oversight Committee shall include as part of their report recommendations for the creation and implementation of a statewide four-year-old kindergarten program for at-risk children. The report shall also include information and recommendations on lead teacher qualifications and options for creating comparable salary schedules for certified teachers employed by private providers.

To aid in this evaluation, the Education Oversight Committee shall determine the data necessary and both public and private providers are required to submit the necessary data as a condition of continued participation in and funding of the program. This data shall include developmentally appropriate measures of student progress. Additionally, the Department of Education shall issue a unique student identifier for each child receiving services from a private provider. The Department of Education shall be responsible for the collection and maintenance of data on the public state funded full day and half-day four-year-old kindergarten programs. The Office of First Steps to School Readiness shall be responsible for the collection and maintenance of data on the state funded programs provided through private providers. The Education Oversight Committee shall use this data and all other collected and maintained data necessary to conduct a research based review of the program's implementation and assessment of student success in the early elementary grades.

SECTION 1A - H63 - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION-EIA

1A.17.(SDE-EIA: XI.C.2-Teacher Evaluations, XI.E.3- Implementation/Education Oversight) The Department of Education shall provide a review of the evaluation results for teachers employed under induction, annual, and continuing contracts to be presented by September 30, annually, to the State Board of Education and the Education Oversight Committee. The Department of Education is directed to oversee the evaluation of teachers at the School for the Deaf and the Blind, the John de la Howe School and the Department of Juvenile Justice under the ADEPT model.

1A.22.(SDE-EIA: XI.E.3.-Evaluation/EIA Programs) Of the funds appropriated in Part IA, Section 1 XI.E.3. for EIA Implementation, Other Operating Expenses, \$349,124 may only be used by the State Department of Education to support its contracted program evaluations and the conduct of the State Board of Education's annual assessment of EIA-funded education reforms and the related report, pursuant to Section 59-6-12. Of the remaining funds appropriated in Part IA, Section 1 XI.E.3. for EIA Implementation, Other Operating Expenses shall be used to support the continuation of program and policy evaluations and studies and to support the state's participation in the Middle Grades Project, at no less than \$100,000. Provided further, for the current fiscal year, \$100,000 shall be provided to the South Carolina Educational Policy Center for collaborative projects with the Department of Education and the Education Oversight Committee to provide research based information and consultation services on technical issues related to establishing a more thorough accountability system for public schools, school districts, and the K-12 education system.

1A.23.(SDE-EIA: XI.F.3-CHE/Teacher Recruitment) Of the funds appropriated in Part IA, Section 1 XI.F.3. for the Teacher Recruitment Program, the S.C. Commission on Higher Education shall distribute a total of \$5,404,014 to the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA-South Carolina) for a state teacher recruitment program, of which \$4,200,000 must be used for the Teaching Fellows Program and of which \$166,302 must be used for specific programs to recruit minority teachers, and shall distribute \$467,000 to S.C. State University to be used only for the operation of a minority teacher recruitment program and therefore shall not be used for the operation of their established general education programs. Working with districts with an absolute rating of Unsatisfactory or Below Average, CERRA will provide shared initiatives to recruit and retain teachers to schools in these districts. CERRA will report annually by October 1 to the Education Oversight Committee and the Department of Education on the success of the recruitment and retention efforts in these schools. The S.C. Commission on Higher Education shall ensure that all funds are used to promote teacher recruitment on a statewide basis, shall ensure the continued coordination of efforts among the three teacher recruitment projects, shall review the use of funds and shall have prior program and budget approval. The S.C. State University program, in consultation with the Commission on Higher Education, shall extend beyond the geographic area it currently serves. Annually, the Commission on Higher Education shall evaluate the effectiveness of each of the teacher recruitment projects and shall report its findings and its program and budget recommendations to the House and Senate Education Committees, the State Board of Education and the Education Oversight Committee by October 1 annually, in a format agreed upon by the Education Oversight Committee and the Department of Education.

1A.26.(SDE-EIA: XI.B-Parenting/Family Literacy) Funds appropriated in Part IA, Section 1 XI.B. for the Parenting/Family Literacy Programs and allocated to the school districts for parenting projects in the prior fiscal year may be retained and expended by the school districts

for the same purpose during the current fiscal year. These funds must be allocated only to school districts that provide comprehensive family literacy programs which address intergenerational cycles of poverty through adult education, early childhood education and parenting programs. Furthermore, any school district that does not provide the evaluation information necessary to determine effective use as required by Section 59-139-10 (A) (1) and by regulation is not eligible to receive additional funding until the requested data is provided. The minimum amount allocated to a district shall be \$35,000. Of the funds appropriated in Part IA, Section 1 XI.B. for the Parenting/Family Literacy \$200,000 must be used for the Accelerated Schools Project at the College of Charleston and \$100,000 is to be used for the South Carolina Urban Leagues state-wide parental involvement programs.

1A.27.(SDE-EIA: XI.B.-Parenting/Family Literacy/Communities- In-Schools) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the State Department of Education shall transfer \$200,000 from the funds appropriated in Part IA, Section 1 XI.B. Parenting/Family Literacy to Communities-In-Schools. These funds are to be utilized to provide technical assistance to local communities in establishing Communities-In-Schools programs statewide. Communities-In-Schools will provide annual reports to the State Department of Education which will include: budget expenditure data, a listing of the communities served and the services provided.

1A.32.(SDE-EIA: XI.C.4-Professional Development on Standards) These funds shall be used for professional development for certificated instructional and instructional leadership personnel in grades kindergarten through 12 in the academic areas for which SBE standards documents have been approved to better link instruction and lesson plans to the standards and to any state-adopted readiness assessment tests, develop classroom assessments consistent with the standards and PACT-style testing, and analyze PACT results for needed modifications in instructional strategies. Funds may also be expended for certificated instructional and instructional leadership personnel in grades six through twelve to achieve competency in teaching reading to students who score below proficient on the reading assessment of PACT. Provided further, that \$250,000 of the funds allocated to professional development must be provided to the Department of Education to implement successfully the South Carolina Readiness Assessment by creating a validation process for teachers to ensure reliable administration of the assessment, providing professional development on effective utilization and establishing the relationship between the readiness measure and third grade standards-based assessments. Multi-day work sessions shall be provided around the state during the summer and during the fall and winter using staff development days, teacher workdays, two of the remaining professional development days shall be set aside specifically for the preparation and opening of schools. District instructional leaders, regional service centers, consortia, department personnel, university faculty, contracted providers, and the resources of ETV may be used as appropriate to implement this intensive professional development initiative. Teachers participating in this professional development shall receive credit toward recertification according to State Board of Education guidelines. Funds provided for professional development on standards may be carried forward into the current fiscal year to be expended for the same purpose. No less than twenty-five percent of the funds allocated for professional development should be expended on the teaching of reading which includes teaching reading across content areas in grades three through eight.

1A.33. (SDE-EIA: XI.C.3-Teacher Supplies) From the funds appropriated, all certified public school, certified special school classroom teachers, certified media specialists, and certified guidance counselors who are employed by a school district or a charter school as of November 30 of the current fiscal year, shall receive reimbursement of two hundred fifty dollars each

school year to offset expenses incurred by them for teaching supplies and materials. Funds shall be disbursed by the department to School districts by July 15 based on the last reconciled Professional Certified Staff (PCS) listing from the previous year. Any deviation in the PCS and actual teacher count will be reconciled by December 31 or as soon as practicable thereafter. School districts shall disburse these funds in a manner separate and distinct from their payroll check on the first day teachers, by contract, are required to be in attendance at school for the current contract year. This reimbursement shall not be considered by the state as taxable income. Special schools include the Governor's School for Science and Math, the Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities, Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School, John de la Howe School, School for the Deaf and the Blind, Felton Lab, Department of Juvenile Justice, and Palmetto Unified School District. Funds distributed to school districts or allocated to schools must not supplant existing supply money paid to teachers from other sources. If a school district requires receipts for tax purposes the receipts may not be required before December 31. Districts that do not wish to require receipts may have teachers retain the receipts and certify for the district they have received the \$250 for purchase of teaching supplies and/or materials and that they have purchased or will purchase supplies and/or materials during the fiscal year for the amount of \$250. Districts shall not have an audit exception related to non-retention of receipts in any instances where a similar instrument is utilized. Any district requiring receipts must notify any teacher from whom receipts have not been submitted between November 25 and December 6 that receipts must be submitted to the district. Districts may not add any additional requirement not listed herein related to this reimbursement. The department must withhold Act 135 funds from any district while in non-compliance with this provision. Any funds not disbursed to teachers may not be retained by the districts and must be returned to the department.

1A.34.(SDE-EIA: XI.E.1-Principal Executive/Leadership Institute Carry Forward) Prior fiscal year funds appropriated in Part IA, Section XI.E.1. for the Principal Executive/Leadership Institute may be carried forward into the current fiscal year and expended for the same purpose. The Institute and all principal evaluation and induction programs must include training for the key role that principals have in supervising the teaching of reading and instilling the importance of literacy in public schools.

1A.37.(SDE-EIA: Specialists in Unsatisfactory Schools) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the State Department of Education may assign teacher specialists, principal specialists, principal leaders, and curriculum specialists to schools designated as unsatisfactory or below average according to the enrollment of the school and as recommended by the review team. Teacher specialists may be assigned to kindergarten level, if recommended by the review team. Furthermore, the average number of teacher specialists assigned to schools may not exceed five. Teacher specialists may be placed across grade levels and across core subject areas when placement meets program criteria based on external review team recommendations, need, number of teachers receiving support, and certification and experience of the specialist. A teacher specialist may be assigned to support classroom teachers in the areas of special education and limited English proficiency when warranted by the needs of the student population, recommended by an external review team and approved by the State Board of Education. Teacher specialists are limited to three years of service at one school unless the specialist submits application for an extension and that application is accepted by the State Department of Education and placement is made. Upon acceptance and placement, the specialist can receive the salary and supplement for two additional years, but is no longer attached to the sending district or guaranteed placement in the sending district following tenure in the program as provided in Section 59-18-1530 (F) of the South Carolina Code of Laws. Teacher specialist funds may be carried forward from the prior fiscal year into the current fiscal year for the Teacher Specialists On-Site Program. A principal specialist may be continued for a

third year if requested by the local school board, recommended by the external review team, and approved by the State Board of Education. For the third year, only the principal specialist salary supplement will be paid by the State.

1A.39.(SDE-EIA: XI.A.3-Institute of Reading) The funds appropriated for the Institute of Reading must be used to implement a comprehensive approach to improving the reading abilities of students in the middle grades and accelerating the learning of middle grade students reading below grade level with strategies based on best practice and providing targeted assistance shown by research to help these students to read at grade level. Funds may also be used in the same manner for high school grades.

1A.40.(SDE-EIA: EOC) The Education Oversight Committee may collect, retain and expend revenue from conference registration and fees; charges for materials supplied to local school districts or other entities not otherwise mandated to be provided by state law; and from other activities or functions sponsored by the committee including public awareness campaign activities. Any unexpended revenue from these sources may be carried forward into the current fiscal year and expended for the same purposes. The Education Oversight Committee is permitted to utilize the funds appropriated to it to fund programs promoting the teaching of economic education in South Carolina.

1A.41.(SDE-EIA: Professional Development) With the funds appropriated for professional development, the Department of Education must disseminate the South Carolina Professional Development Standards, establish a professional development accountability system, and provide training to school leadership on the professional development standards, also training must be provided to educators on assessing student mastery of the content standards. The State Department of Education shall revise professional development activities and programs, including professional development on the standards, the SC Reading Initiative, and programs for administrators, to include emphasis on strategies and services for students at risk of retention. The State Department of Education shall provide information on the activities and programs and measures to gauge their effectiveness to the State Board of Education and the Education Oversight Committee by January 1.

1A.42.(SDE-EIA: Principal Specialists) For each principal specialist funded and designated to a school district, the school district may designate an apprentice to work with the specialist.

1A.43.(SDE-EIA: Report Card Printing) The State Department of Education is prohibited from printing the Annual School and District Report Card in any other color other than black and white. School districts must advertise the results of their schools' report cards in an audited newspaper of general circulation in their geographic area within 45 days. If the audited newspaper has previously published the entire report card results as a news item, this requirement is waived for the school and district. Notwithstanding Section 59-18-930, the requirement to mail school and district report cards is suspended and report cards may be sent home with the students. The parent survey required by Section 59-28-190 may be sent home with the students and the department must use the results of the parent survey to report parent perceptions on the school report cards.

1A.44. (SDE-EIA: Technical Assistance) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in order to best meet the needs of low-performing schools, funds appropriated for homework centers, teacher specialists, principal specialists, retraining grants, technical assistance to below average schools, and principal leaders must be allocated accordingly. Schools receiving an absolute rating of below average must submit to the Department of Education a school

renewal plan that includes actions consistent with each of the alternative researched-based technical assistance criteria as approved by the Education Oversight Committee and the Department of Education. Upon approval of the plans by the Department of Education and the State Board of Education, the school will receive an allocation of not less than \$75,000, taking into consideration the enrollment of the schools. The funds must be expended on strategies and activities as expressly outlined in the school renewal plan which may include, but are not limited to, professional development, the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), homework centers, diagnostic testing, supplement health and social services, or comprehensive school reform efforts. The schools will work with the Department of Education to broker the services of technical assistance personnel as needed and as stipulated in the school renewal plan. Funds not expended in the current fiscal year may be carried forward and expended for the same purpose in the next fiscal year.

Schools receiving an absolute rating of unsatisfactory will be provided an external review team evaluation. Based upon the external review team evaluation, the schools must submit to the Department of Education a school renewal plan that includes actions consistent with the alternative research-based technical assistance criteria as approved by the Education Oversight Committee and the Department of Education. Upon approval of the plan by the Department of Education and the State Board of Education, the schools will receive an allocation of not less than \$250,000, taking into consideration the enrollment of the schools and the recommendations of the external review team. The funds must be expended on strategies and activities as expressly outlined in the school renewal plan which may include, but are not limited to, professional development, the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), homework centers, diagnostic testing, supplement health and social services, or comprehensive school reform efforts. The schools will work with the Department of Education to broker the services of technical assistance personnel as needed and as stipulated in the school renewal plan. Funds not expended in the current fiscal year may be carried forward and expended for the same purpose in the next fiscal year.

With the funds appropriated to the Department of Education for technical assistance services, the department will assist schools with an absolute rating of unsatisfactory or below average in designing and implementing school renewal plans and in brokering for technical assistance personnel as needed and as stipulated in the school renewal plan. In addition, the department must monitor the expenditure of funds and the academic achievement in schools receiving these funds and report to the General Assembly and the Education Oversight Committee by January 1 of 2007 and then by January 1 of each fiscal year following as the General Assembly may direct.

1A.46.(SDE-EIA: School Districts and Special Schools Flexibility) All school districts and special schools of this State may transfer up to one hundred percent of funds between programs to any instructional program provided the funds are utilized for direct classroom instruction.

The South Carolina Department of Education must establish a procedure for the review of all transfers authorized by this provision. The details of such transfers must be provided to members of the General Assembly upon request. School districts and special schools may carry forward unexpended funds from the prior fiscal year into the current fiscal year to be used for the same purpose. All transfers executed pursuant to this provision must be completed by May first of the current fiscal year. All school districts and special schools of this State may expend funds received from the Children's Education Endowment Fund for school facilities and fixed equipment assistance, for any instructional program. The Education Oversight Committee shall review the utilization of the flexibility provision to determine how it enhances or detracts from the achievement of the goals of the educational accountability system, including the ways in which school districts and the state organize for maximum benefit to classroom instruction,

priorities among existing programs and services, and the impact on short, as well as, long-term objectives. The State Department of Education shall provide the reports on the transfers to the Education Oversight Committee for the comprehensive review. This review shall be provided to the members of the General Assembly annually. Any grant or technical assistance funds allocated directly to an individual school may not be reduced or reallocated within the school district and must be expended by the receiving school only according to the guidelines governing the funds.

1A.47.(SDE-EIA: XI.A.4-Retraining Grants) Funds appropriated for retraining grants in the prior fiscal year may be retained and expended during the current fiscal year by the schools that were awarded the grants during the prior fiscal year for the same purpose. Funds appropriated for Retraining Grants may be used for training for superintendents and school board members. Beginning with the 2004 annual school report card, a school initially designated as unsatisfactory or below average on the current year's report card must receive by January 1, \$10,000 from the funds appropriated for Retraining Grants and must expend the funds for planning purposes in accordance with Section 59-18-1560. The school is then eligible to receive additional retraining grant allocations in the following three school years in accordance with Section 59-18-1560 provided that the school meets the guidelines developed by the Department. A school designated as unsatisfactory or below average for consecutive years may combine the additional retraining grants allocations and homework center allocations for professional development or for extended school day in accordance with the school's improvement plan. Furthermore, any school that does not provide the evaluation information necessary to determine effective use as required by Section 59-18-1560 is not eligible to receive additional funding until the requested data is provided as outlined in the program guidelines.

1A.48.(SDE-EIA: XI.F.3-School Improvement Council Assistance) The School Improvement Council Assistance will coordinate with the department to target schools and school districts designated as unsatisfactory. The department shall coordinate with and monitor the services provided to the schools and districts by the School Improvement Council Assistance.

1A.49.(SDE-EIA: Critical Geographic Area) Notwithstanding the provision of Section 59-26-20 (j) for those students seeking loan cancellation under the Teacher Loan Program after July 1, 2004, "critical geographic area" shall be defined as schools that have an absolute rating of below average or unsatisfactory, schools where the average teacher turnover rate for the past three years is 20 percent or higher, or schools that meet the poverty index criteria at the 70 percent level or higher. The list shall also include special schools, alternative schools, and correctional centers as identified by the State Board of Education. After July 1, 2005, students shall have their loan canceled based on those schools or districts designated as a critical geographic area at the time of employment. The definition of critical geographic area shall not change for those students who are in the process of having a loan canceled, on or before June 30, 2005. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2005-06 the maximum loan amount will be increased to an amount not to exceed \$20,000.

1A.50.(SDE-EIA: Unallocated Funds for Teacher Specialists) The Department of Education shall develop procedures and establish a timeline so schools that receive an unsatisfactory rating or a below average rating on the annual report card are given an option to choose technical assistance offered by the department that includes teacher specialists, principal specialists and other personnel assigned under the tiered system or alternative research-based technical assistance. Criteria for selecting alternative research-based technical assistance are to be approved by the Education Oversight Committee and the Department of Education. For

the current school year, the department may utilize a supplemental alternative technical assistance program in a state of emergency school district. The funds appropriated for alternative research-based technical assistance must be allocated to below average and unsatisfactory schools based upon the school's enrollment and school type with no school receiving less than \$100,000 or more than \$300,000 annually. Furthermore, it is the intent that the alternative research-based technical assistance will be provided for a minimum of three years in order to implement fully systemic reform and to provide opportunity for building local education capacity. The Education Oversight Committee, in cooperation with the Department of Education and with the schools and school districts participating in the alternative technical assistance programs, will monitor the effectiveness of the alternative technical assistance program.

1A.52.(SDE-EIA: EAA Summer School, Grades 3-8) Funds appropriated for summer school shall be allocated to each local public school district based on the number of academic subject area scores below the basic on the prior year Spring PACT administration for students in grades three through eight and on the number of students entering ninth grade who score below proficient in reading. Individual student scores on the PACT shall not be the sole criterion used to determine whether a student on an academic plan the prior year will be placed on probation or retained. Individual student scores on the PACT shall not be the sole criterion for requiring students to attend summer school. School districts may consider other factors such as student performance, teacher judgment, and social, emotional, and physical development in placing students on academic probation or requiring summer school attendance. Students may not be placed on academic probation or retained based solely on the PACT scores. The State Department of Education working with the Education Oversight Committee must develop a method to supplement the PACT with diagnostic training and materials aligned to the content standards. Current year appropriations may be expended for prior year EAA summer school purposes. Local public school districts shall utilize these funds in accordance with the requirements of Section 59-18-500 of the 1976 Code. The State Department of Education is directed to utilize PACT-like tests aligned with standards to be administered to students on academic probation required to attend summer school. The test shall be a determinate in judging whether the student has the skills to succeed at the next grade level. The State Board of Education shall establish regulations to define the extenuating circumstances including death of an immediate family member or severe long-term student illness, under which the requirements of 59-18-900(D) may be waived. Furthermore, the Department of Education, working with and through the SC Afterschool Alliance, will provide \$250,000 to produce a model of voluntary quality standards for out-of-school time programs, develop a directory of technical assistance, and identify gaps of service.

1A.55.(SDE-EIA: National About Face Pilot Program) Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Education for homework centers, \$610,000 shall be used for the National About Face Pilot Program.

1A.59.(SDE-EIA: EAA Report Card Criteria) The Education Oversight Committee may base ratings for school districts and high schools on criteria that include graduation from high school with a state high school diploma and ratings may be based on criteria aligned with workforce needs including, but not limited to, exit examination performance and other criteria identified by technical experts and appropriate groups of educators and workforce advocates. For other schools without standard-based assessments the ratings may be based upon criteria identified by technical experts and appropriate groups of educators. All ratings criteria must be approved by the Education Oversight Committee.

1A.61.(SDE-EIA: Excellence in Middle School Initiative) Funds appropriated for the Excellence in Middle Schools Initiative shall be used to continue to fund the number of guidance counselors, school safety officers and/or school nurses in middle/junior high schools. The funding allocation shall be based proportionately on the number of middle/junior high schools in each district.

1A.62.(SDE-EIA: After School Program/Homework Centers Allocation) The Department of Education is authorized to allocate after school program/homework center funds first, by establishing an equitable base amount for unsatisfactory schools; second, by establishing an equitable base amount for below average schools; and third, by allocating any remaining funds based on the ADM of below average schools. By November 1 of the fiscal year, schools receiving funds for homework centers must report to the Department of Education and to the Education Oversight Committee on changes in the PACT-English Language Arts scores in both reading and writing of students who were participants in the homework centers during the prior school year.

1A.63.(SDE-EIA: Early Childhood Review) From the funds appropriated for EIA Four-Year Old Early Childhood, the Department of Education shall utilize up to \$300,000 to institute a plan for reviewing, on a district basis, early childhood assets of schools and districts based on 4K entry DIAL 3 scores, and South Carolina Readiness Assessment Reports. To accomplish this, the department shall use reports that analyze program assets and provide guidance to local schools on the effective use of the reports to enhance quality gaps. Children will be tracked from early childhood programs to fifth grade and beyond to study the relationships of strong early childhood programs and increased performance on PACT, decreased drop out scores, decreased referral for special education programs, and increased graduation rates. This review may not be used as a part of the EAA Report Card for school year 2006-07.

1A.66.(SDE-EIA: Teacher Recruitment/Retention Task Force) The Education Oversight Committee shall convene a task force to evaluate current teacher recruitment and retention policies, particularly those that impact on schools that have historically underachieved. Included in the task force will be representatives from the Department of Education, the Center for Educator Recruitment, Retention, and Advancement (CERRA-South Carolina), institutions of higher learning, the Student Loan Corporation, the Commission on Higher Education, and classroom teachers from throughout South Carolina.

1A.67.(SDE-EIA: Report Card Information) The percentage each school district expended on classroom instruction as defined by the Department of Education's In\$ite classification for "Instruction" must be printed on the Annual School and District Report Card.

SECTION 1AA - H66 -LOTTERY EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT

1AA.3. (LEA: SDE Transfer Restriction) Funds appropriated from the Education Lottery Account for K-5, Reading, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies Programs, grants, or technical assistance funds allocated directly to an individual school may not be transferred and may only be expended for the purposes for which these funds have been appropriated. However, all school districts may transfer up to one hundred percent of other lottery funds appropriated to school districts between programs to any instructional program provided the funds are utilized for direct classroom instruction.

1AA.7. (LEA: FY 06-07 Lottery Funding) There is appropriated from the Education Lottery Account for the following education purposes and programs and funds for these programs and

purposes shall be transferred by the Budget and Control Board as directed below. These appropriations must be used to supplement and not supplant existing funds for education.

The Budget and Control Board is directed to prepare the subsequent Lottery Expenditure Account detail budget to reflect the appropriations of the Education Lottery Account as provided in this section.

All Education Lottery Account revenue shall be carried forward from the prior fiscal year into the current fiscal year including any interest earnings and of those funds, \$30,600,000 shall be used to support the appropriations contained below. After the first \$30,600,000 of lottery funds carried forward from the prior fiscal year are realized, the next \$12,150,000 shall be directed to the State Board of Technical and Comprehensive Education to be used for the Allied Health Initiative. The next \$500,000 shall be directed to the Arts Partnership of Greater Spartanburg, Inc. for educational programming in the Science Center and History Museum. The programming is to be based on South Carolina K-12 Curriculum and be used to support teachers in their classrooms and for science career development. The remaining balance is directed to the South Carolina State Library for equal distribution to each county for local libraries.

For Fiscal Year 2006-07 certified net lottery proceeds and investment earnings and any other proceeds identified by this provision are appropriated as follows:

- (1) Commission on Higher Education--Tuition Assistance Two-Year Institutions, \$45,000,000;
- (2) Commission on Higher Education--LIFE Scholarships as provided in Chapter 149 of Title 59, \$87,911,636;
- (3) Commission on Higher Education--HOPE Scholarships as provided in Section 59-150-370, \$7,144,909;
- (4) Commission on Higher Education--Palmetto Fellows Scholarships as provided in Section 59-104-20, \$17,830,758;
- (5) Commission on Higher Education--Need-Based Grants, \$11,246,093;
- (6) Tuitions Grants Commission--Tuition Grants, \$7,766,604;
- (7) Commission on Higher Education--National Guard Tuition Repayment Program as provided in Section 59-111-75, \$1,700,000;
- (8) Commission on Higher Education--Endowed Chairs as provided in Chapter 75 of Title 2, \$30,000,000;
- (9) South Carolina State University--\$2,500,000;
- (10) Technology--Public 4-Year Universities, 2-Year Institutions, and State Technical Colleges, \$3,600,000;
- (11) Department of Education--Teacher Specialists, \$11,000,000;
- (12) Department of Education--K-5 Reading, Math, Science & Social Studies Program as provided in Section 59-1-525, \$46,500,000;
- (13) Department of Education--Grades 6-8 Reading, Math, Science & Social Studies Program, \$2,000,000; and
- (14) Commission on Higher Education--Higher Education Excellence Enhancement Program, \$4,700,000.

Fiscal Year 2006-07 funds appropriated to the Commission on Higher Education for Tuition Assistance must be distributed to the technical colleges and 2-year institutions as provided in Section 59-150-360.

The Commission on Higher Education is authorized to temporarily transfer funds between appropriated line items in order to ensure the timely receipt of scholarships and tuition assistance. It is the goal of the General Assembly to fund the Tuition Assistance program at such a level to support at least \$996 per student per term for full time students.

Fiscal Year 2006-07 net lottery proceeds and investment earnings in excess of the certified net lottery proceeds and investment earnings for this period are appropriated and must be used

to ensure that all LIFE, Palmetto Fellows, and HOPE scholarships for Fiscal Year 2006-07 are fully funded.

If the lottery revenue received for Fiscal Year 2006-07 is less than the amounts appropriated, the projects and programs receiving appropriations for any such year shall have their appropriations reduced on a pro rata basis, except that a reduction must not be applied to the funding of LIFE, HOPE, and Palmetto Fellows Scholarships.

The Commission on Higher Education is authorized to use up to \$260,000 of the funds appropriated in this provision for LIFE, HOPE, and Palmetto Fellows scholarships to provide the necessary level of program support for the scholarship award process.

For Fiscal Year 2006-07, \$8,400,000 certified from unclaimed prizes shall be appropriated for Technology: Public 4-Year Universities, 2-Year Institutions, and State Technical Colleges.

Of any unclaimed prize funds available in excess of the Board of Economic Advisors estimate, the first \$200,000 shall be directed to the S.C. School for the Deaf and the Blind for technology, equipment, and support for multi-disabled students enrolled in education degree and vocational certificate programs. The next \$250,000 will be directed to the Department of Education for Agriculture in the Classroom. The next \$2,600,000 will be directed to the Commission on Higher Education for Tuition Assistance Two-Year Institutions. Any individual item funded by unclaimed prize funds that are available in excess of the Board of Economic Advisors estimate may be partially funded in the order in which it appears, to the extent that revenues are available. The allocations of Section 59-150-230(I) of the 1976 code are suspended for the current fiscal year. All additional revenue in excess of the amount certified by the Board of Economic Advisors for unclaimed prizes shall be distributed to the Higher Education Tuition Grants Commission for Tuition Grants.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 59-150-355 of the 1976 Code or any other provision of law, the Budget and Control Board may distribute funds from the Education Lottery Account on a monthly basis during the final quarter of the fiscal year.

APPENDIX B

2003–2005 Report Card Ratings and Changes Recommended

B-1: South Carolina School and District Ratings, 2003 - 2005

B-2: Review of Primary School Ratings Criteria and Recommendations for Their Revision

B-3: Revision of High School Report Card Ratings Replacement of LIFE Scholarship Criterion With End-of-Course Test Performance

Appendix B-1

South Carolina School and District Ratings 2003 - 2005

Summary Tables

Report card ratings are awarded to each school organizational unit: primary, elementary, middle, or high. A school that has kindergarten through eighth grade receives two sets of ratings (and two sets of report cards). One set of ratings for this school pertains to the elementary grades in the school (Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test [PACT] results in grades three through five), and the other set of ratings is based on the middle school grades (PACT results from grades six through eight). Primary level schools that do not contain PACT-tested grades (such as a school having kindergarten through second grade) and career and career and technology centers also receive ratings based on different sets of criteria. Some schools, such as new schools, do not receive ratings.

The frequencies of ratings reported for all primary, elementary, middle, and high schools in South Carolina are listed in the tables that follow.

Table 1
ALL SCHOOLS (K–2 PRIMARY, ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE, AND HIGH SCHOOLS)
2003–2005 School Report Card Ratings
Number and Percentage of School Report Cards

Rating	2005 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2004 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2003 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2005 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2004 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2003 Improvement Rating Number (%)
Excellent	169 (15.2)	224 (20.4)	217 (19.9)	76 (6.9)	170 (15.9)	76 (7.0)
Good	304 (27.4)	372 (33.9)	359 (32.9)	210 (19.1)	215 (20.1)	176 (16.3)
Average	349 (31.5)	312 (28.5)	319 (29.3)	84 (7.6)	97 (9.1)	90 (8.3)
Below Average	222 (20.0)	160(14.6)	151 (13.9)	339 (30.8)	276 (25.8)	274 (25.4)
Unsatisfactor y	65 (5.9)	28 (2.6)	44 (4.0)	393 (35.7)	313 (29.2)	464 (43.0)
Total	1109 (100)	1096 (100)	1090 (100)	1102 (100)	1071* (100)	1080 (100)
New/Special— No Rating	18	25	14	25	50	14

Note: Totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding. Some schools may have received more than one report card if the school contained more than one organizational grade level (elementary, middle, high). Based on data from the S.C. Department of Education, November 2004, November 2005, and March 2006.

*Thirty-one schools receiving Absolute and Improvement Ratings in 2004 were missing 2003 data, most likely because they were new schools in 2004.

Table 2
K-2 PRIMARY SCHOOLS ONLY (GRADE TWO IS HIGHEST GRADE LEVEL)
2003-2005 School Report Card Ratings
Number and Percentage of School Report Cards

Rating	2005 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2004 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2003 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2005 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2004 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2003 Improvement Rating Number (%)
Excellent	28 (100)	25 (100)	23 (100)	7 (29.2)	11 (52.4)	4 (20.2)
Good	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	17 (70.8)	10 (47.6)	16 (80.0)
Average	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Below Average	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Unsatisfactor y	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Total	28 (100)	25 (100)	23 (100)	24 (100)	21* (100)	20 (100)
New/Special— No Rating	0	0	0	4	4	3

Note: Totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding. Based on data from the S.C. Department of Education, November 2004, November 2005, and March 2006.

*Four schools receiving Absolute and Improvement Ratings in 2004 were missing 2003 data, most likely because they were new schools in 2004.

Table 3
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS ONLY
2003-2005 School Report Card Ratings
Number and Percentage of School Report Cards

Rating	2005 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2004 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2003 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2005 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2004 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2003 Improvement Rating Number (%)
Excellent	60 (9.7)	106 (17.3)	114 (18.8)	24 (3.9)	20 (3.4)	27 (4.5)
Good	199 (32.3)	241 (39.3)	227 (37.4)	121 (19.6)	145 (24.6)	94 (15.5)
Average	229 (37.1)	199 (32.5)	196 (32.3)	55 (8.9)	41 (6.9)	52 (8.6)
Below Average	113 (18.3)	64 (10.4)	66 (10.9)	193 (31.3)	161 (27.3)	141 (23.3)
Unsatisfactor y	16 (2.6)	3 (0.5)	4 (0.7)	224 (36.3)	223 (37.8)	292 (48.2)
Total	617 (100)	613 (100)	607 (100)	217 (100)	590* (100)	606* (100)
New/Special— No Rating	3	5	2	3	28	3

Note: Totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding. Some schools may have received more than one report card if the school contained more than one organizational grade level (elementary, middle, high). Based on data from the S.C. Department of Education, November 2004, November 2005, and March 2006.

*Fourteen schools receiving Absolute and Improvement Ratings in 2004 were missing 2003 data, most likely because they were new schools in 2004.

Table 4
MIDDLE SCHOOLS ONLY
2003–2005 School Report Card Ratings
Number and Percentage of School Report Cards

Rating	2005 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2004 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2003 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2005 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2004 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2003 Improvement Rating Number (%)
Excellent	9 (3.3)	11 (4.1)	13 (4.8)	1 (0.4)	7 (2.6)	1 (0.4)
Good	47 (17.3)	67 (25.1)	72 (26.8)	30 (11.0)	48 (17.8)	16 (5.9)
Average	91 (33.5)	91 (34.1)	95 (35.3)	15 (5.5)	31 (11.5)	23 (8.6)
Below Average	92 (33.8)	80 (30.7)	70 (26.0)	111 (40.8)	112 (41.6)	91 (33.8)
Unsatisfactor y	33 (12.1)	16 (6.0)	19 (7.1)	115 (42.3)	71 (26.4)	138 (51.3)
Total	272 (100)	267 (100)	269 (100)	272 (100)	269 (100)	269 (100)
New/Special— No Rating	2	5	1	2	3	1

Note: Totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding. Some schools may have received more than one report card if the school contained more than one organizational grade level (elementary, middle, high). Based on data from the S.C. Department of Education, November 2004, November 2005, and March 2006.

*Seven schools receiving Absolute and Improvement ratings in 2004 were missing 2003 data, most likely because they were new schools in 2004.

Table 5
HIGH SCHOOLS ONLY
2003–2005 School Report Card Ratings
Number and Percentage of School Report Cards

Rating	2005 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2004 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2003 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2005 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2004 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2003 Improvement Rating Number (%)
Excellent	72 (37.5)	82 (42.9)	67 (35.1)	44 (23.3)	132 (69.1)	44 (23.8)
Good	58 (30.2)	64 (33.5)	60 (31.4)	42 (22.2)	12 (6.3)	50 (27.0)
Average	29 (15.1)	22 (11.5)	28 (14.7)	14 (7.4)	25 (13.1)	15 (8.1)
Below Average	17 (8.9)	14 (7.3)	15 (7.8)	35 (18.5)	3 (1.6)	42 (22.7)
Unsatisfactor y	16 (8.3)	9 (4.7)	21 (11.0)	54 (28.6)	19 (9.9)	34 (18.4)
Total	192 (100)	191 (100)	191 (100)	189 (100)	191 (100)	185* (100)
New/Special— No Rating	13	15	11	16	15	6

Note: Totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding. Some schools may have received more than one report card if the school contained more than one organizational grade level (elementary, middle, high). Based on data from the S.C. Department of Education, November 2004, November 2005, and March 2006.

*Six schools receiving Absolute and Improvement ratings in 2004 were missing 2003 data, most likely because they were new schools in 2004.

Table 6
DISTRICTS ONLY
2003–2005 District Report Card Ratings
Number and Percentage of District Report Cards

Rating	2005 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2004 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2003 Absolute Performanc e Rating Number (%)	2005 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2004 Improvement Rating Number (%)	2003 Improvement Rating Number (%)
Excellent	5 (5.9)	9 (10.6)	9 (10.6)	6 (7.1)	15 (17.6)	4 (4.7)
Good	28 (32.9)	37 (43.5)	26 (30.6)	5 (5.9)	11 (12.9)	7 (8.2)
Average	33 (38.8)	26 (30.6)	32 (37.7)	16 (18.8)	37 (43.5)	24 (28.2)
Below Average	15 (17.6)	12 (14.1)	12 (14.1)	33 (38.8)	12 (14.1)	20 (23.5)
Unsatisfactor y	4 (4.7)	1 (1.2)	6 (7.1)	25 (29.4)	10 (11.8)	30 (35.3)
Total	85 (100)	85 (100)	85 (100)	85 (100)	85 (100)	85 (100)
New/Special – No Rating	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Totals may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding. Based on data from the S.C. Department of Education, November 2004, November 2005, and March 2006.

Appendix B-2

Review of Primary School Ratings Criteria And Recommendations for Their Revision Executive Summary January 23, 2006

(NOTE: Recommendations 1 and 2 below were adopted by the EOC in February 2006.)

This report presents the results of a review of the primary school ratings criteria by Education Oversight Committee (EOC) staff and by an advisory committee composed of primary school principals and other early childhood educators. The purpose of the review was to develop recommendations regarding revisions of the criteria needed to improve their accuracy and usefulness for evaluating primary school quality. Primary schools are defined for the purposes of the report card ratings as schools having students enrolled in grade two or below, and thus do not participate in the PACT testing program. The numbers of primary schools receiving report cards have varied between 23 and 28 schools since 2003. Since test or other outcome data have not been available for primary schools, the school ratings have been based on other measures (student attendance; pupil-teacher ratios; parent involvement; external accreditation; and professional development related to the educational needs of children under age eight years).

The process followed for this review of the primary school ratings involved three steps:

- A review of the research literature pertaining to the measurement of the quality and performance of primary schools;
- An analysis of South Carolina primary and elementary school performance and school profile data;
- Consultation with a Primary Ratings Advisory Committee to review the research and data analyses and identify appropriate criteria for determining primary school ratings.

Following reviews of the literature, analyses of the data, and consultation with the Primary School Ratings Advisory Committee at a meeting on November 30, 2005, proposed recommendations for the revision of the ratings and ratings simulations based on those recommendations were provided to members of the advisory committee via e-mail for their consideration. The following recommendations regarding the revision of the primary school Absolute Ratings are made as the result of this process.

Recommendation 1

1. Add Prime Instructional Time, Percent Teachers with Advanced Degrees, and Percent Teachers Returning From the Previous Year as rating criteria;
2. Remove Student Attendance as a rating criterion because it is one of the components of Prime Instructional Time;
3. Establish new weighting points for the Parent Involvement criterion based on 2005 data;

The revised primary school Absolute Ratings criteria, points, and weightings based on this recommendation are listed in the following table.

**Recommended Absolute Ratings Criteria for Primary Schools
Beginning in 2006-2007
(Schools Enrolling Only Grade Two or Below)**

Criterion (Weight)	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
Prime Instructional Time (14.3%)	95.2% or greater	91.4–95.1%	83.8–91.3%	80.0–83.7%	Less than 80.0%
Pupil-Teacher Ratio (14.3%)	21 or less	22-25	26-30	31-32	Greater than 32
Parent Involvement (14.3%)	99.9% or greater	99.3–99.8 %	97.6–99.2%	96.8–97.5%	Less than 96.8%
External Accreditation (14.3%)	NAEYC or Montessori	SDE and SACS-early childhood	SDE	Conducting self-study	Not pursuing accreditation
Professional Development on Educational Needs of Children Under 8 Years of Age (14.3%)	1.5 days or greater	1.0 to 1.5 days	1.0 day	0.5 to 0.9 days	Less than 0.5 day
Teachers with Advanced Degrees (14.3%)	80.3% or greater	66.6-80.2%	39.2-66.5%	25.5-39.1%	Less than 25.5%
Teachers Returning from Previous Year (14.3%)	99.1% or greater	93.7-99.0%	82.8-93.6%	77.3-82.7%	Less than 77.3%

The primary school ratings based on the criteria in the table above were simulated using 2005 data. The simulated ratings, which are reported in Table 4 in the full report, result in a wider variation in school ratings than are observed with the use of the current criteria. Using the current criteria, all the primary schools have received Excellent Absolute Ratings since 2002, but the use of the new criteria results in some schools receiving Good or Average ratings. Using the recommended ratings criteria, new primary schools will not receive ratings for their first four years of operation because data on teachers returning from the previous year will not be available. This delay is similar to the delay in ratings for new high schools, which are not rated for their first three years

of operation because longitudinal exit exam results are not available until 10th grade students at the school have reached the end of the 12th grade.

Recommendation 2

The primary school Improvement Ratings are calculated by subtracting the absolute rating index for the previous year from the index for the current year; the difference score determines the Improvement Rating. Since the ratings criteria will differ between 2005-2006 and 2006-2007, it is recommended that 2006-2007 primary school Improvement Ratings be determined by recalculating the 2005-2006 school index to include the revised ratings criteria before subtracting it from the 2006-2007 index. The primary school Improvement Rating for 2006-2007 will thus be based on comparable data.

The recommended ratings criteria include variables which have been demonstrated to be significantly related to PACT achievement in the elementary school, suggesting that the same measures may be effective at predicting progress in achievement in the primary schools. The primary school rating criteria have also been identified in the literature as appropriate measures of primary school quality. It is hoped that these criteria will provide a more accurate picture of the quality and performance of primary schools.

**Review of Primary School Ratings Criteria
And Recommendations for Their Revision
January 23, 2006**

This report presents the results of a review of the primary school ratings criteria by Education Oversight Committee (EOC) staff and by an advisory committee composed of primary school principals and other early childhood educators. The purpose of the review was to develop recommendations regarding revisions of the criteria needed to improve their accuracy and usefulness for evaluating primary school quality. Primary schools are defined for the purposes of the report card ratings as schools having students enrolled in grade two or below, and thus do not participate in the PACT testing program. The numbers of primary schools receiving report cards have varied between 23 and 28 schools since 2003. Since test or other outcome data have not been available for primary schools, the school ratings have been based on other measures (student attendance; pupil-teacher ratios; parent involvement; external accreditation; and professional development related to the educational needs of children under age eight years).

An earlier review by the EOC analyzed the primary school rating criteria for their rigor and for their relationship to student achievement in third grade. This study, reported to the EOC in February 2005, found no statistically significant relationship between the PACT achievement index and any of the five primary school rating criteria or the primary school absolute rating index based on those five criteria. The EOC had planned to add the results from the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale-Revised (ECERS-R) to the rating criteria in 2004-2005, but the use of this instrument was precluded through a proviso to the appropriations bill. At its June 2005 meeting the EOC decided to maintain the five rating criteria listed above through the 2005-2006 school year, but to seek the advice of primary school educators for recommended revisions needed to provide the most accurate and useful information to evaluate the quality of primary schools in a standards-based environment.

Background Information

Since PACT testing begins in grade 3 and there are no other state testing program tests administered for accountability purposes to all students below grade 3, achievement data from students attending primary schools are not available for calculating school ratings. The lack of assessment data for primary schools poses a complex challenge for the accountability system. Based on the large body of research documenting the difficulties encountered when attempting to reliably assess the school achievement of young children, who develop rapidly but at different paces, the EOC has previously taken the position that the PACT accountability tests should not be administered below grade 3. Through the school year 2005-2006, the Absolute and Improvement Ratings for primary schools are based on the five criteria listed in Table 1; none of these criteria are based on academic assessments.

Table 1
Absolute Ratings Criteria for Schools with Only Grade Two or Below
2000-2001 Through 2005-2006 School Years

Criterion (Weight*)	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
Student Attendance (20%)	98% or greater	96–97.99%	94–95.99%	92–93.99%	Less than 92%
Pupil-Teacher Ratio (20%)	21 or less	22–25	26–30	31–32	Greater than 32
Parent Involvement (20%)	90% or more	75–89 %	60–74%	30–59%	29% or less
External Accreditation (20%)	NAEYC or Montessori	SDE and SACS-early childhood	SDE	Conducting self-study	Not pursuing accreditation
Professional Development on Educational Needs of Children Under Age 8 (20%)	More than 1.5 days	1 to 1.5 days	1 day	.5 to .9 day	Less than .5 day

To calculate a primary school's Absolute Rating, the school's level on each of the criteria is converted to a point weight ranging from 1 to 5, and the five point weights are averaged to determine an absolute rating index. The values of the absolute rating index determine the school's Absolute Rating based on the values listed in Table 2

Table 2
Absolute Index Values for Determining Absolute Ratings

Year	Range of Indices Corresponding to Absolute Rating				
	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
2005	3.6 and above*	3.2-3.5*	2.8-3.1	2.4-2.7	Below 2.4
2006	3.7 and above*	3.3-3.6*	2.9-3.2	2.5-2.8	Below 2.5
2007	3.8 and above*	3.4-3.7*	3.0-3.3	2.6-2.9	Below 2.6
2008	3.9 and above*	3.5-3.8*	3.1-3.4	2.7-3.0	Below 2.7
2009	4.0 and above*	3.6-3.9*	3.2-3.5	2.8-3.1	Below 2.8
2010	4.1 and above*	3.7-4.0*	3.3-3.6	2.9-3.2	Below 2.9

* School must meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for all students.

Based on the current ratings criteria, all of the primary schools have received Absolute Ratings of “Excellent” since 2002. The lack of variability in the primary school Absolute Ratings has raised questions regarding the accuracy of the rating criteria. This review of the primary school rating criteria and their possible revision was conducted to better meet the purpose of the accountability system to accurately portray school performance so that high performance can be recognized and schools in need of assistance can be identified.

Review Procedures

The process followed for this review of the primary school ratings involved three steps:

- A review of the research literature pertaining to the measurement of the quality and performance of primary schools;
- An analysis of South Carolina primary and elementary school performance and school profile data;
- Consultation with a Primary Ratings Advisory Committee to review the research and data analyses and identify appropriate criteria for determining primary school ratings.

A review of the research literature on the measurement and reporting of primary school quality was conducted in spring 2005 by a doctoral graduate student in educational research in consultation with EOC staff. The research review revealed that the same kinds of measures of primary school quality are being used in other states and nations as in South Carolina. These quality measures fall into four general categories:

1. Measures of school climate such as attendance, grade retention, and class size;
2. Measures of teacher quality in the school, such as advanced degrees, certification, stability (serving in same school over a period of time), and professional development opportunities;
3. Measures of the extent and quality of parent involvement in their children’s education;

4. Measures of the quality of curriculum and instruction in the school such as fidelity to instructional models and accreditation by professional education organizations.

Unlike some states, South Carolina collects and reports measures from all four categories on the school report cards. Some states such as Illinois and Kentucky report test results when available along with measures from the above categories on their primary school report cards. One of the reasons for the variability among states in the kinds of data reported for primary schools may be related to one finding from the literature review: unlike in other countries, there is not a generally agreed-upon definition of primary schools or their purpose in South Carolina or the United States. The literature review did not identify new or different measures for evaluating primary school quality which differ substantially from those already collected and reported in South Carolina, but it did specify measures which have been demonstrated to be related to school academic achievement in other contexts.

The 2005 primary school report card data were compiled and analyzed and are listed in Appendix A. The data in Table A-1a reveal rather narrow distributions of parent involvement data and student attendance, but a wide variation in average days of professional development devoted to the educational needs of children under eight years of age. The low variation among schools in criteria such as parent involvement is reflected in the points awarded to schools for each criterion: all 28 schools received 5 points for their parent involvement measure in 2005 (Table A-3). The wide variation in professional development occurred because some schools are participating in special programs such as Reading First which provide very extensive professional development. The profile data listed in Table A-4 show the distributions of other potential measures which could be used in the primary school ratings calculations.

A Primary Ratings Advisory Committee was identified and convened on November 30, 2005 to review the research and data analyses and to identify appropriate criteria for determining primary school ratings. The members of the advisory committee are listed in Appendix B and the charge issued to them at the November 30 meeting is in Appendix C. The advisory committee members were provided copies of the literature review and background information prior to the meeting and reviewed those materials, including data analyses, during the meeting. Committee comments regarding the current ratings criteria and the identification of possible additional criteria from both small- and large-group sessions were collected and compiled.

The advisory committee discussions are summarized below.

1. Concerns were expressed about the accuracy of the data collected (definitions may be unclear; there are concerns about the accuracy of self-reported data);
2. Student attendance issues were identified – student attendance is not compulsory for four-year-old program (4K) students and is difficult to enforce for five-year-old kindergarten (5K) students;
3. Data from 4 year old programs are not reported on the report card (attendance, teachers, and enrollment data from 4K programs are kept in separate databases);
4. Would like measures of quality of curriculum and instruction – external accreditation is good, but costs associated with National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) accreditation have increased;

5. Some participants would like teacher attendance and/or retention as a ratings criterion, but others disagreed;
6. Some participants expressed support for the use of student assessment outcome measures in the ratings criteria, but there was no agreement on the source of such data or on its suitability for accountability use; there was general agreement that measures such as the SC Readiness Assessment (SCRA) are not appropriate for accountability purposes;
7. Made the observation that the professional development devoted to the educational needs of children under eight years criterion is affected by school participation in Reading First and other programs not available to all schools;
8. Suggested that we could increase the rigor of parent involvement, such as requiring at least 2 conferences per child each year and/or by re-norming the current measure;
9. There was wide but not unanimous support (about 75% of the principals and the majority of other early childhood experts attending the meeting) for the use of the Early Childhood Environmental Ratings Scale-Revised (ECERS-R) as a criterion for primary schools, or the use of ECERS-R subscales or other environmental measures focused on curriculum and instruction as rating criteria;
10. It was suggested that we could re-norm current criteria (for example, all schools received the maximum point weight of 5 for Parent Involvement because the current point weight criteria do not reflect the high levels of parent involvement observed in primary schools, so re-norming the data would provide a more accurate picture of the differences among schools in this measure);
11. There were suggestions that the use of legally minimal criteria for assigning a point weight of 3 (such as SDE accreditation or 30:1 student:teacher ratio) should be changed to lower point weights such as 1 or 2;
12. Most agreed that a description of the goals and purposes of primary schools in South Carolina is needed and should be developed.

Subsequent to the advisory committee meeting, EOC staff explored the issues brought up and conducted further data analyses based on the committee's identification of potential ratings criteria. The data collection concerns were followed up and communicated to the committee, and the committee was asked to provide additional guidance on clarifying and improving data collection procedures. The advisory committee identified several possible ratings criteria (such as teacher attendance and retention listed in issue 5 above), and several other potential criteria currently collected for the report card profile were identified from the literature review for further analysis.

Since an earlier EOC review had found no statistically significant relationships between the primary school criteria and later school achievement, an effort was made to identify potential rating criteria which are related to academic achievement. Since academic achievement data are not available for the primary schools but they are available for elementary schools, the potential ratings criteria were analyzed at the elementary school level to identify statistically significant relationships with overall school achievement (the school's absolute rating index based on PACT performance). Using multiple linear regression and correlation as the analytical methods, the relationships between school absolute rating indexes and the following measures were identified:

- Prime instructional time;
- Teachers returning from previous year;
- Student:teacher ratio;

Teachers with advanced degrees;
Dollars spent per student;
Percent teachers with provisional/emergency certificates;
Days of professional development per teacher;
Students suspended for violent/criminal behavior;
Percent spent on teacher salaries.

These variables were chosen based on the criteria that they had been discussed at the advisory committee meeting, that they were part of the current primary rating criteria or they were identified in the literature review. They were also variables over which schools or school districts could have some measure of control and thus could be useful for accountability purposes. Other measures, such as percent of students with disabilities or the percentage of students in poverty, were not chosen for this study because the characteristics of children when they enter school are not something over which schools typically have control and such measures are not appropriate for accountability. The addition of ECERS-R results as a primary school ratings criterion was supported by a majority of the advisory committee members, but ECERS-R results were not included in these analyses because of current legal restrictions to its use for accountability. In addition, ECERS-R results for elementary schools were not available for analysis to evaluate their relationship to elementary school PACT achievement.

The following measures were identified as having a statistically significant relationship to the elementary school absolute rating index:

Prime instructional time, which is a composite of student and teacher attendance, was positively related to achievement – higher levels of prime instructional time were related to higher school PACT achievement;

Teachers returning from the previous year was also positively related to achievement – schools having higher percentages of teachers returning from the previous year were more likely to have higher achievement;

Student:teacher ratio had a positive relationship with school achievement (higher student:teacher ratios were associated with higher school achievement), which at first glance is a somewhat surprising finding but it reflects the fact that lower-achieving schools are more likely to have additional resources to reduce class sizes;

Dollars spent per student had a negative relationship with school achievement (higher amounts spent per student were associated with lower school achievement), which also reflects the additional resources allocated to lower-achieving schools;

Teachers with advanced degrees had a positive relationship with school achievement - schools in which a larger proportion of teachers had advanced degrees were more likely to have higher overall achievement;

Percent teachers with provisional or emergency certificates had a negative relationship with school achievement, as one would expect (schools having higher percentages of teachers with emergency or provisional certificates were more likely to have lower overall achievement).

There are some issues to consider about the use of these measures as primary school rating criteria. The distribution of the percent of teachers with provisional or emergency certificates is not appropriate to convert to a 5-point weighting scale for the ratings, since the median percent is 0 and most primary schools report that none of their teachers have emergency or provisional certificates. Information on the percent of teachers returning from the previous year is not available for a four-year period for new schools because the data for this measure are averaged over the previous three years. Dollars spent per student is negatively related to achievement, but the amount of money spent does not directly “cause” low or high achievement, but is rather associated with other factors such as the provision of technical assistance and additional resources by the state and school districts. There are similar issues with the student:teacher ratio, but educators generally believe that the attainment of lower student:teacher ratios is conducive to better instruction and learning and there is support for this belief in the research literature. The finding of a positive relationship between student:teacher ratio and achievement in South Carolina elementary schools may instead reflect the extra resources the state and districts provide for low-achieving schools.

The Primary School Ratings Advisory Committee discussions, the literature survey, and the statistical analyses suggest that Prime Instructional Time, Percent Teachers with Advanced Degrees, and Percent Teachers Returning From the Previous Year would be useful primary school rating criteria and would not require additional data collection. Since Student Attendance is a component of Prime Instructional Time, it should be deleted from the ratings criteria to avoid duplication if Prime Instructional Time is added as a criterion. The analysis of the ratings criteria data also suggest that the point scale for Parent Involvement should be re-normed to improve the accuracy of the variable in evaluating differences in the extent of parent involvement activities among schools.

Recommendations

Proposed recommendations for the revision of the ratings and ratings simulations based on those recommendations were provided to members of the Primary School Ratings Advisory Committee via e-mail for their consideration. The following recommendations regarding the revision of the primary school Absolute Ratings are based on the factors and issues listed above and received the most positive response from the advisory committee.

Recommendation 1

1. Add Prime Instructional Time, Percent Teachers with Advanced Degrees, and Percent Teachers Returning From the Previous Year as rating criteria;
2. Remove Student Attendance as a rating criterion because it is one of the components of Prime Instructional Time;
3. Establish new weighting points for the Parent Involvement criterion based on 2005 data;

The revised primary school Absolute Ratings criteria, points, and weightings based on this recommendation are listed in Table 3.

Table 3
Recommended Absolute Ratings Criteria for Primary Schools
Beginning in 2006-2007
(Schools Enrolling Only Grade Two or Below)

Criterion (Weight*)	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
Prime Instructional Time (14.3%)	95.2% or greater	91.4–95.1%	83.8–91.3%	80.0–83.7%	Less than 80.0%
Pupil-Teacher Ratio (14.3%)	21 or less	22-25	26-30	31-32	Greater than 32
Parent Involvement (14.3%)	99.9% or greater	99.3–99.8 %	97.6–99.2%	96.8–97.5%	Less than 96.8%
External Accreditation (14.3%)	NAEYC or Montessori	SDE and SACS-early childhood	SDE	Conducting self-study	Not pursuing accreditation
Professional Development on Educational Needs of Children Under 8 Years of Age (14.3%)	1.5 days or greater	1.0 to 1.5 days	1.0 day	0.5 to 0.9 days	Less than 0.5 day
Teachers with Advanced Degrees (14.3%)	80.3% or greater	66.6-80.2%	39.2-66.5%	25.5-39.1%	Less than 25.5%
Teachers Returning from Previous Year (14.3%)	99.1% or greater	93.7-99.0%	82.8-93.6%	77.3-82.7%	Less than 77.3%

The primary school ratings based on the criteria in Table 3 were simulated using 2005 data. The results of the simulation are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Simulation of Primary School Absolute Ratings Based on New Criteria
Compared to 2005 Primary School Results

Absolute Rating	2004-2005 Ratings Data – Number of Schools	Simulated Data – Number of Schools
Excellent	28	14
Good	0	6
Average	0	1
Below Average	0	0
Unsatisfactory	0	0
Total	28	21

Note: Seven (7) schools did not have data in 2004-2005 on teachers returning from the previous year

The simulated ratings are more variable than those based on the current criteria. The lack of data on teachers returning from the previous year will result in new schools not receiving ratings for their first four years in operation. This delay is similar to the delay in ratings for new high schools, which are not rated for their first three years of operation because longitudinal exit exam results are not available until 10th grade students at the school have reached the end of the 12th grade.

Recommendation 2

The primary school Improvement Ratings are calculated by subtracting the absolute rating index for the previous year from the index for the current year; the difference score determines the Improvement Rating. Since the ratings criteria will differ between 2005-2006 and 2006-2007, it is recommended that 2006-2007 primary school Improvement Ratings be determined by recalculating the 2005-2006 school index to include the revised ratings criteria before subtracting it from the 2006-2007 index. The primary school Improvement Rating for 2006-2007 will thus be based on comparable data.

The recommended ratings criteria include variables which have been demonstrated to be significantly related to PACT achievement in the elementary school, suggesting that the same measures may be effective at predicting progress in achievement in the primary schools. The primary school rating criteria have also been identified in the literature as appropriate measures of primary school quality. It is hoped that these criteria will provide a more accurate picture of the quality and performance of primary schools.

APPENDIX Analyses of 2005 Primary School Report Card Data

Table A-1a

Performance Data for Primary School Report Card Ratings, 2004-2005

Variable	Number Schools	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Minimum	Maximum
Student Attendance	28	95.2	1.48	95.45	89.3	96.8
Pupil:Teacher Ratio	28	19.4	2.94	19.25	10.0	25.5
Parent Involvement	28	98.5	1.69	99.0	91.3	100.0
Professional Development on Needs of Children Under 8	28	9.9	5.96	9.15	0.5	21.8

Table A-1b

External Accreditation, 2004-2005

Highest Accreditation Level Reported	Number of Schools
State Department of Education	2
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	21
American Montessori Society, National Association for the Education of Young Children	5
Total	28

Table A-2

Grade Levels Served, 2004-2005

Grade Levels	Number (%) of Schools
PK-K	1 (3.6)
PK-1	6 (21.4)
PK-2	14 (50.0)
K-2	7 (25.0)
Total	28 (100)

Table A-3

2004-2005 Point Weights for Primary School Report Card Absolute Rating Criteria

Rating Criterion	Number Schools Attaining Point Weight For Rating Criterion				
	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
Student Attendance (n=28)	1	1	18	8	0
Student Teacher Ratio (n=28)	0	0	1	4	22
Parent Involvement (n=28)	0	0	0	0	28
Professional Development (n=28)	0	2	0	0	26
Accreditation (n=28)	0	0	2	21	5

Table A-4
Primary School Profile Data, 2004-2005

Variable	Number Schools	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Enrollment	28	499	477.4	156.36	50	737
1 st graders full day kindergarten	26	98.8	98.2	2.07	91.3	100
Student retention rate	28	4.55	5.4	2.78	0.5	10.7
Students – disabilities other than speech	28	3.9	5.0	5.47	0.2	29.5
Students over-age for grade	28	0.3	0.6	1.16	0	6.2
Suspensions/expulsions	28	0	0.0	0.03	0	0.2
Teachers – number in school	28	37.5	34.9	11.20	5	54
Teachers – advanced degrees	27	52.2	52.9	13.70	30.4	80.9
Continuing contract teachers	27	88.6	85.6	10.31	56.0	100
Teachers – highly qualified	27	96.3	95.2	5.86	72.1	100
Teachers – emergency/provisional certificates	27	0	1.5	2.01	0	6.3
Teachers – retention	21	89.1	88.2	5.45	78.0	98.4
Teacher attendance	28	94.6	94.2	2.19	86.8	96.4
Teachers – average salary	27	40952.0	41184.37	3046.19	35004	46341
Professional development	28	16.55	16.0	5.63	6.4	29.1
Principal – years at school	28	4.5	6.4	6.82	0.1	26
Prime instructional time	28	88.55	87.6	3.80	74.7	92.3
Dollars per student	25	5871.0	7082.80	6220.73	3764	36675*
Percent expenditures for teacher salaries	25	62.8	63.2	5.28	54.2	76.2
Number teachers surveyed	28	33.5	32.7	9.79	5	54
Teachers – % satisfied with learning environment	28	98.7	95.9	5.59	80.0	100
Teachers - % satisfied with social/physical environment	28	97.35	95.2	6.24	72.0	100
Teachers - % satisfied with home-school relations	28	89.7	83.5	16.27	40.7	100

*School primarily serves students with disabilities.

APPENDIX Members of the Primary School Ratings Advisory Committee
Primary School Ratings Advisory Committee

Louise Anthony*
Executive Director
Meyer Center for Special Children (Stone Plaza)
1132 Rutherford Road
Greenville, SC 29609

Loretta Arnette
Principal
Gilbert Primary School
520 Main Street
Gilbert, SC 29054

Mac Brown
Instruction & Teacher Education
University of South Carolina
College of Education
CDRC, 207
Columbia, SC 29208

James V. Call, Jr.*
Principal
Woodruff Primary School
200 Lucy P Edwards Road
Woodruff, SC 29388

Kim Clardy
Principal
Marshall Primary School
218 Bannister Street
Belton, SC 29627

Floyd Creech
Coordinator, Early Childhood
Florence School District One
319 South Dargan Street
Florence, SC 29506-2589

Joy Cutler*
Principal
Latta Early Childhood Center
134 Latimer Street
Latta, SC 29565

Cathy Duncan*
Principal
Ninety Six Primary School
119 S Cambridge St
Ninety Six, SC 29666

Bobbie Edge*
Principal
North Myrtle Beach Primary School
901 11th Avenue N
N Myrtle Beach, SC 29582

Lynn Foes
Principal
Goose Creek Primary
200 Foster Creek Road
Goose Creek, SC 29445

Jay Freeman*
Principal
Saluda Primary School
200 Matthews Drive
Saluda, SC 29138

Nancy Freeman*
Instruction & Teacher Education
University of South Carolina
College of Education
CDRC, 207
Columbia, SC 29208

Martha Garrick
Principal
Edisto Primary School
3239 PO Cardova Road
PO Box 110
Cardova, SC 29039

Tracy Gaskins
Principal
Berkeley Elementary School
715 Hwy 6
Moncks Corner, SC 29461

Marie Gibbons
Principal
Manning Early Childhood Center
2759 Raccoon Road
Manning, SC 29102

Donna Goodwin
Principal
Frances F Mack Primary School
161 Gaston Street
Gaston, SC 29053

Angie Grice
Principal
Easterling Primary School
600 E Northside Avenue
Marion, SC 29571

Leslie Hightower
Principal
Swansea Primary School
1195 I W Hutto Road
Swansea, SC 29160

Hal Howington
Principal
Blacksburg Primary School
1010 East Cherokee Street
Blacksburg, SC 29702

Gracyn Jackson
Principal
Cheraw Primary School
321 High Street
Cheraw, SC 29520

Stacey Jaillette
Principal
Bennettsville Primary School
301 Jefferson Street
Bennettsville, SC 29512

Bunny Mack
Office of Research
SC Department of Education
Rutledge Building, Rm 1106
1429 Senate St
Columbia, SC 29201

June Moorhead
Principal
Myrtle Beach Primary School
612 29th Avenue N
Myrtle Beach, SC 29577

Jo Anne Richardson
Principal
North Mullins Primary School
105 Charles Street
Mullins, SC 29574

Pat Russell
Principal
Concrete Primary School
535 Powdersville Main
Easley, SC 29642

Robin Snipes
Director, Office of Early Childhood
SC Department of Education
3700 Forest Drive
Landmark II, Suite 101
Columbia, SC 29204-4010

Marcus Sutton*
Principal
Petersburg Primary School
326 Arnold Street
Pageland, SC 29728

Victoria Thompkins
Principal
Congaree-Wood Early Childhood Center
737 Pine Ridge Drive
W Columbia, SC 29172

Shirley Tomlin
Principal
Oakland Primary School
5415 Oakland Drive
Sumter, SC 29154

Patricia Toney
Principal
Southside Early Childhood Center
1615 Blanding Drive
Hartsville, SC 29550

Tonya Watson
Principal
Batesburg-Leesville Primary School
800 Summerland Avenue
Batesburg-Leesville, SC 29006

Alan Wilson
Principal
Sangaree Elementary School
1460 Royle Road
Summerville, SC 29483

Dan Wuori
School Readiness Officer
Office of First Steps
1300 Sumter Street, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29201

* Did not attend November 30, 2005
meeting

APPENDIX Charge Issued to Primary School Ratings Advisory Committee November 30, 2005 Meeting

Background Information and Charge to Group Primary School Ratings Advisory Group November 30, 2005

From the EAA (*emphasis added*):

Section 59-18-900. (A) The Education Oversight Committee, working with the State Board of Education, is directed to establish an annual report card and its format to report on the performance for the individual elementary, middle, high schools, and school districts of the State. The school's ratings on academic performance must be emphasized and an explanation of their significance for the school and the district must also be reported. *The annual report card must serve at least four purposes:*

- (1) inform parents and the public about the school's performance;*
- (2) assist in addressing the strengths and weaknesses within a particular school;*
- (3) recognize schools with high performance; and*
- (4) evaluate and focus resources on schools with low performance.*

From annual proviso to Appropriation Act (*emphasis added*):

1A.62. (SDE-EIA: EAA Report Card Criteria) The Education Oversight Committee may base ratings for school districts and high schools on criteria that include graduation from high school with a state high school diploma and ratings may be based on criteria aligned with workforce needs including, but not limited to, exit examination performance and other criteria identified by technical experts and appropriate groups of educators and workforce advocates. *For other schools without standards-based assessments the ratings may be based upon criteria identified by technical experts and appropriate groups of educators. All ratings criteria must be approved by the Education Oversight Committee.*

- All the primary schools have received Absolute Ratings of "Excellent" for the last four years;
- A study of the relationships between the primary school ratings criteria and third grade PACT achievement of students who had attended primary schools did not demonstrate positive relationships between the criteria and later achievement;
- In 2005, 12 of the 28 primary schools met all AYP objectives and 16 did not;
- In a pilot study conducted in 2004, the average Early Childhood Environmental Scale-Revised (ECERS-R) score in South Carolina primary schools exceeded the national average, although a few schools did not meet minimal quality expectations.

Charge to Advisory Group:

After reviewing the available data and the current ratings criteria, identify any changes or additions to the criteria needed to better fulfill the purposes of the accountability system and make recommendations to the Education Oversight Committee regarding the primary school ratings criteria.

Some questions to consider in the review:

- How well are the current primary school ratings criteria fulfilling the purposes listed in the EAA?

- How accurate is the measurement of the current ratings criteria, and how might the accuracy be increased?
- Are there other criteria for the primary school ratings which may also be appropriate to use?

Appendix B-3
Revision of High School Report Card Ratings
Replacement of LIFE Scholarship Criterion
With End-of-Course Test Performance
Executive Summary
January 23, 2006

(NOTE: Recommendations 1 and 2 below were adopted by the EOC in February 2006.)

In April 2005 the Education Oversight Committee adopted a plan for replacing the LIFE Scholarship criterion with end-of-course test results in the high school absolute ratings beginning with the 2006-2007 school year. The plan called for the simulation of school ratings data based on end-of-course test results and the development of recommendations for inclusion of the test results by the High School Ratings Advisory Committee.

At its meeting on January 10, 2006 the High School Ratings Advisory Committee reviewed current high school rating criteria and the end-of-course test results and the simulations of ratings based on various methodologies and made the following recommendations to the Education Oversight Committee regarding the revision of the ratings.

Recommendation 1: Beginning with the 2006-2007 school year, replace the LIFE Scholarship eligibility criterion in the high school ratings with the percent of passing scores (70 or higher) on the end-of-course tests administered in the high school. In 2006-2007 the end-of-course tests in Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2, English 1, Biology 1/Applied Biology 2, and Physical Science will be included in the rating. Calculate the ratings based on the criteria and weightings listed in the table below.

Criteria for High School Ratings Beginning in 2006-2007
End-of-Course Results Replace LIFE Scholarship Eligibility

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
Longitudinal Exit Exam Passage Rate (30%)	100%	97.5– 99.9%	90.7– 97.4%	87.3– 90.6%	Below 87.3%
First-attempt HSAP Passage Rate (20%)	62.9% or more	53.7– 62.8%	37.4– 53.6%	26.7– 37.3%	Below 26.7%
% Scoring 70 or Above on End-of-Course Tests (20%)	87.8% or more	72.4– 87.7%	41.6– 72.3%	26.2– 41.5%	Below 26.2%
Graduation Rate (30%)	88.3% or more	79.6– 88.2%	62.2– 79.5%	53.5– 62.1%	Below 53.5%

The data simulations based on this recommendation (presented in Table 9 of the full report) revealed that the revised ratings based on 2005 data closely parallel those actually observed in 2005. This similarity in the current ratings and the simulated ratings indicate that any disruption of the ratings system associated with changes in the criteria will be minimized and will make year to year rating results more comparable.

Recommendation 2: The US History end-of-course test is scheduled to be administered for the first time in the 2006-2007 school year. The High School Advisory Committee recommends that data from the US History end-of-course test results be included in the high school and district ratings beginning with the 2007-2008 school year. The US History course test will have been administered three times by the summer of 2007. The use of the test in the ratings beginning with the fall semester of the 2007-2008 school year conforms to the EOC policy of not including a new test in the ratings system before the third administration of the test.

Recommendation 3: Although the advisory committee was not asked to address the school district rating criteria in its meeting, in its review of the end-of-course test results the committee noted that the revised Physical Science course standards and the end-of-course test based on the revised standards will take effect in the 2006-2007 school year. The revisions to the Physical Science course standards are intended in part to address the difficulties teachers have faced when attempting to teach the large number of standards in both chemistry and physics in the old course standards. These instructional difficulties are reflected in the relatively low performance of students on the Physical Science end-of-course test (see Table 5 in the full report). Since new standards will be in effect beginning in 2006-2007, the advisory committee recommends that the Physical Science end-of-course test results not be used for the school district ratings in 2005-2006, but that the Physical Science test results be used for both the high school and district ratings beginning in 2006-2007.

**Revision of High School Report Card Ratings
Replacement of LIFE Scholarship Criterion
With End-of-Course Test Performance
January 23, 2006**

In April 2005 the Education Oversight Committee adopted a plan for replacing the LIFE Scholarship criterion with end-of-course test results in the high school absolute ratings beginning with the 2006-2007 school year. The plan called for the simulation of school ratings data based on end-of-course test results and the development of recommendations for inclusion of the test results by the High School Ratings Advisory Committee. This document contains the results of this process.

Background Information

High school report card ratings are based on a school's performance on a set of four criteria. The criteria for 2005-2006 for calculating high school Absolute and Improvement Ratings include:

- ❑ Longitudinal Exit Examination performance: This factor gauges the percentage of tenth-grade students who pass the Exit Exam by the spring graduation two years later. Students transferring to other schools should be deleted from the calculation; however, students dropping out are included. The BSAP Exit Exam results will continue to be used for the determination of longitudinal performance through 2005, but will be replaced by longitudinal performance on the HSAP examinations in the 2005-2006 school year.
- ❑ First-attempt HSAP Exit Examination performance: The percentage of students taking the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) for the first time who passed both the English language arts and mathematics subtests by scoring at the performance level of 2 or higher.
- ❑ Eligibility for LIFE Scholarships: The percentage of students in the spring graduating class who meet selected criteria for Legislative Incentive for Future Excellence (LIFE) Scholarships (i.e., meeting both the grade point average and SAT/ACT criteria established by the state). Beginning with the 2002-2003 school year, this criterion has consisted of the percentage of students in the spring graduating class who qualify for LIFE Scholarships under the following criteria: SAT of 1100 or higher or ACT of 24 or higher, and B average; it does not include the class rank criterion.
- ❑ Four-year Graduation rate: The percentage of all (including students with disabilities) ninth-grade students four years prior to the year of the report card who earn a standard high school diploma (not GED), adjusted for transfers in and out of the school. Transfers to adult education who fail to earn high school diplomas within four years (inclusive of summer school) after entering grade nine are to be counted as non-graduates in the calculation of the graduation rate for South Carolina accountability purposes. For a student to be considered a transfer to an adult education high school completion program, the student must comply with the program requirements of a minimum of 16 instructional hours per week with minimum attendance of 60 hours per earned Carnegie unit. Data from students who meet the state diploma requirements as a result of attending summer school following their senior year are to be included in the calculation of the graduation rate; this should take effect as soon as the State Department of Education and school districts can arrange for timely receipt of the data needed.

Ratings are calculated using a mathematical formula that results in an index. The following point distribution is applied to each of the criteria for the calculation of the absolute index (the percentage weighting for each criterion is applied to the calculation of the index):

Table 1

Criteria for High School Ratings Through 2005-2006

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
Longitudinal Exit Exam Passage Rate (30%)	100%	97.5–99.9%	90.7–97.4%	87.3–90.6%	Below 87.3%
First-attempt HSAP Passage Rate (20%)	62.9% or more	53.7–62.8%	37.4–53.6%	26.7–37.3%	Below 26.7%
Eligibility for LIFE Scholarships (20%)	38.6% or more	28.7–38.5%	8.9–28.6%	4.0–8.8%	Below 4.0%
Graduation Rate (30%)	88.3% or more	79.6–88.2%	62.2–79.5%	53.5–62.1%	Below 53.5%

The report card Absolute Ratings are based on an index calculated from the point values assigned to a school on the basis of Table 1 above. The index is calculated using the following formula:

- (1) Match the school's data/performance to the points assigned to each rating criterion in Table 1.
- (2) Add the weighted points for each criterion. Weighted points are calculated by multiplying the assigned points by the weighting factor assigned to each criterion.

The resulting index determines the school's Absolute Rating based on the values in Table 2.

Table 2
Index Values for Determining Absolute Ratings

Year	Range of Indexes Corresponding to Absolute Rating				
	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
2005	3.6 and above*	3.2–3.5*	2.8–3.1	2.4–2.7	Below 2.4
2006	3.7 and above*	3.3–3.6*	2.9–3.2	2.5–2.8	Below 2.5
2007	3.8 and above*	3.4–3.7*	3.0–3.3	2.6–2.9	Below 2.6
2008	3.9 and above*	3.5–3.8*	3.1–3.4	2.7–3.0	Below 2.7
2009	4.0 and above*	3.6–3.9*	3.2–3.5	2.8–3.1	Below 2.8
2010	4.1 and above*	3.7–4.0*	3.3–3.6	2.9–3.2	Below 2.9

*School must meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the category, “All Students.”

In March 2004 the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) voted to modify the report card rating criterion for high schools by replacing the LIFE Scholarship criteria with the results from the end-of-course tests for high school courses. The end-of-course tests are administered to all students at the end of specific courses. Currently, end-of-course tests are offered for the following courses: Algebra I/Math for Technologies II; English I; Physical Science; and Biology I/Applied Biology II. An end-of-course test for US History is scheduled for initial implementation during the 2006-2007 school year. The end-of-course test results constitute 20% of a student’s final grade in the course.

In April 2005 the EOC reviewed initial studies of the issue and adopted a plan for replacing the LIFE Scholarship criterion with end-of-course test results in the high school absolute ratings beginning with the 2006-2007 school year. The EOC plan includes the stipulation that the end-of-course test results used for the high school ratings should include only the results from all students enrolled in the high school who take an end-of-course test(s) during the school year on which the rating is based. This is based on Section 59-18-900 (B) of the Education Accountability Act (EAA), which requires that only scores from students enrolled in the school during the year of the ratings can be used to determine in the calculation of absolute and improvement ratings. The end-of-course test results are reported as the percentage of scores of 70 or above on all end-of-course tests administered in the school during the current school year (includes results from the summer following the Fall and Spring semesters of the current school year).

In April 2005 the EOC adopted the requirement that the end-of-course test results be reported on the school and district report cards beginning with the 2005-2006 school year. Also the EOC decided at this meeting that the end-of-course test results should replace the LIFE Scholarship criterion in the school district Absolute Ratings beginning with the 2005-2006 school year. The EOC reviewed data simulations based on different weightings for the district Absolute Rating criteria at its June 2005 meeting and determined the methodology to be used for replacing LIFE Scholarship criteria with end-of-course test results. The methodology for calculating the 2005-2006 district ratings was published in the 2005-2006 Accountability Manual in June 2005.

Data Simulations and Review by High School Ratings Advisory Committee

Members of the High School Ratings Advisory Committee met on January 10, 2006 to evaluate the impact of the use of end-of-course test results on the high school ratings (members of the committee are listed in Appendix A). The high school report card and assessment data listed in the tables in this report were provided to the Advisory Committee by EOC staff. Table 3 shows the distribution of the high school Absolute Ratings on the November 2005 report cards. This distribution provides a baseline for the simulation of ratings based on end-of-course data because one of the goals for the revision of the ratings is to maintain a stable ratings system over time so year-to-year comparisons can be made.

Table 3
High School Report Card Absolute Ratings
Data From School Year 2004-2005

Rating	Number of Schools	Percent
Excellent	72	37.5
Good	58	30.2
Average	29	15.1
Below Average	17	8.9
Unsatisfactory	16	8.3
Total	192	100

Table 4 shows the statistics from the 2004-2005 report card data for each high school rating criterion and for the absolute index based on those criteria. These statistics are based on data obtained from the State Department of Education (SDE). The absolute rating index, which is calculated based on the levels of the rating criteria as described above, ranges from a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 5 points. The average high school absolute rating index in 2005 corresponds to a rating of "Good" (see Table 2 above for conversion of indexes to ratings).

Table 4
2004-2005 High School Rating Criteria Statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Schools
First-attempt HSAP Passage Rate	69.4	14.69	72.7	12.5	100	199
Longitudinal Exit Exam Passage Rate	94.3	4.74	95.3	70.0	100	190
Eligibility for LIFE Scholarship	14.7	12.33	11.8	0	80.8	194
Four-year Graduation Rate	75.5	13.59	77.0	0	100	195
Absolute Rating Index	3.4	0.71	3.4	1	5	192

The high school end-of-course test results are listed in Table 5 for all the tests combined and for each course tested. The data in Table 5 are based on the percentage of student scores of 70 or above on the tests and were calculated from the test data files provided by the SDE. The data listed were calculated based on the data from students tested in each high school. Data from students taking high school credit courses in middle schools and junior high schools were not included in the analyses because only scores from students enrolled in a high school during the same year as the ratings are determined can be used in the calculations. The data in Table 5 show that, on average, 57% of scores on all the end-of-course tests administered in high schools were at the passing level or above. Physical Science scores were the lowest and Algebra 1/Math for the Technologies 2 scores were the highest.

Table 5
2004-2005 High School End-of-Course Test Results
Percent of Scores 70 or Above (% Passing)

End-of-Course Test(s)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Schools
All End-of-Course Tests	57.0	15.39	58.7	8.93	97.9	201
Algebra 1/Math for Technologies II	74.1	15.98	77.1	0	100	198
English 1	61.9	15.47	62.3	0	98.8	199
Biology 1/Applied Biology 2	58.4	20.92	62.6	0	100	197
Physical Science	35.5	19.05	33.9	0	96.3	196

The end-of-course test points for calculating the absolute rating index were determined by creating a distribution around the mean percent passing based on standard deviation units. Using this method, end-of-course performance two or more standard deviations above the mean are awarded five points and results more than two standard deviations below the mean receive one point in the calculation of the school absolute index. Results between minus two and plus two standard deviations are distributed as shown in Table 6.

Table 6
End-of-Course Test Results
Distribution of Points For Calculation of High School Ratings

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
% Scoring 70 or Above on End-of-Course Tests	87.8% or more	72.4–87.7%	41.6–72.3%	26.2–41.5%	Below 26.2%

Recommendations

Based on their reviews and discussions, the High School Ratings Advisory committee made the following recommendations to the Education Oversight Committee at their January 10, 2006 meeting.

Recommendation 1: Beginning with the 2006-2007 school year, replace the LIFE Scholarship eligibility criterion in the high school ratings with the percent of passing scores (70 or higher) on the end-of-course tests administered in the high school. Calculate the ratings based on the criteria and weightings listed in Table 7.

Table 7
Criteria for High School Ratings Beginning in 2006-2007
End-of-Course Results Replace LIFE Scholarship Eligibility

Criterion	Points Assigned				
	5	4	3	2	1
Longitudinal Exit Exam Passage Rate (30%)	100%	97.5–99.9%	90.7–97.4%	87.3–90.6%	Below 87.3%
First-attempt HSAP Passage Rate (20%)	62.9% or more	53.7–62.8%	37.4–53.6%	26.7–37.3%	Below 26.7%
% Scoring 70 or Above on End-of-Course Tests (20%)	87.8% or more	72.4–87.7%	41.6–72.3%	26.2–41.5%	Below 26.2%
Graduation Rate (30%)	88.3% or more	79.6–88.2%	62.2–79.5%	53.5–62.1%	Below 53.5%

The advisory committee saw the replacement of the LIFE Scholarship eligibility criterion by the end-of-course test results as positive because they believed that they can directly affect course level achievement through improved instruction, which would benefit all students in the school. The advisory committee members expressed some frustration with the SAT and ACT components of the LIFE Scholarship criteria because they see those scores as less responsive to school instructional efforts. The EAA also calls for the school ratings to be based on the state curriculum and performance standards; the end-of-course tests are based on those standards, while the SAT and ACT are not.

The advisory committee also reviewed the other criteria in the high school ratings and expressed the need for maintaining stability in the high school ratings criteria over time. For example, the HSAP first attempt criterion replaced the BSAP first attempt criterion in 2004 and the longitudinal exit exam data will be based on HSAP rather than BSAP data in 2006. While welcoming the addition of end-of-course test results as a rating criterion, the Advisory committee members requested that further changes to the ratings such as adding new criteria or changing the point values of the old criteria be avoided if possible for the next three to five years to give them time to address the curricular and instructional needs related to the current criteria.

The simulation of school ratings based on the advisory committee recommendation is presented below.

Recommendation 2: The US History end-of-course test is scheduled to be administered for the first time in the 2006-2007 school year. The High School Advisory Committee recommends that data from the US History end-of-course test results be included in the high school and district ratings beginning with the 2007-2008 school year. The US History course test will have been administered three times by the summer of 2007. The use of the test in the ratings beginning with the fall semester of the 2007-2008 school year conforms to the EOC policy of not including a new test in the ratings system before the third administration of the test.

Recommendation 3: Although the advisory committee was not asked to address the school district rating criteria in its meeting, in its review of the end-of-course test results the committee noted that the revised Physical Science course standards and the end-of-course test based on the revised standards will take effect in the 2006-2007 school year. The revisions to the Physical Science course standards are intended in part to address the difficulties teachers have faced when attempting to teach the large number of standards in both chemistry and physics in the old course standards. The instructional difficulties are reflected in the relatively low performance of students on the Physical Science end-of-course test (see Table 5). Since new standards will be in effect beginning in 2006-2007, the advisory committee recommends that the Physical Science end-of-course test results not be used for the school district ratings in 2005-2006, but that the test results be used for both the high school and district ratings beginning in 2006-2007.

Simulation of High School Ratings Based on Recommendation 1

The point criteria listed in Table 7 were applied to the 2004-2005 high school data to simulate the number of points awarded for each rating criterion if the values in Table 7 were used. These results are listed in Table 8.

Table 8
Simulation of Ratings Calculation Points
End-of-Course Results Replace LIFE Scholarship Eligibility
High School Report Card Absolute Rating Criteria
Data From School Year 2004-2005

Rating Criterion	Number (%) Schools Attaining Point Weight For Rating Criterion				
	1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
Longitudinal Exit Exam Success (n=190)	14 (7.4)	15 (7.9)	113 (59.5)	38 (20.0)	10 (5.3)
% First Attempt HSAP Passing Both Tests (n=197)	1 (0.5)	4 (2.0)	23 (11.7)	25 (12.7)	144 (73.0)
% Students Scoring 70 or Above on End-of-Course Tests (n=198)	3 (1.5)	26 (13.1)	141 (71.2)	25 (12.6)	3 (1.5)
Four-Year Graduation Rate (n=195)	8 (4.1)	9 (4.6)	104 (53.3)	50 (25.6)	24 (12.3)

The high school Absolute Ratings were recalculated based on the criteria in Table 7 to simulate the results using end-of-course test results. The results are listed in Table 9, which can be

compared to the baseline 2005 ratings in Table 3 above. While the distribution of the simulated 2005 ratings based on end-of-course test results is slightly higher than that actually observed in 2005, it is quite similar. Members of the High School Ratings Advisory Committee pointed out that two factors will affect the ratings in the future: the yearly increase in rigor in the levels of the absolute rating index will make it more difficult to maintain the same Absolute Rating Level without increasing performance; and, the longitudinal exit exam performance will be based on HSAP performance rather than on BSAP beginning with the 2005-2006 school year and longitudinal HSAP performance is unknown at this time.

Table 9
Simulated High School Report Card Absolute Ratings
End-of-Course Results Replace LIFE Scholarship Eligibility
Data From School Year 2004-2005

Rating	Number of Schools	Percent
Excellent	80	42.1
Good	66	34.7
Average	23	12.1
Below Average	10	5.3
Unsatisfactory	11	5.8
Total	190	100

Appendix Members of the High School Ratings Advisory Committee
High School Ratings Advisory Committee

Daryl Brown
Principal
Carver's Bay High School
13002 Choppee Road
Hemingway, SC 29554

David Burnett
Director of Research
SC Department of Education
1429 Senate Street, Rutledge Building,
Room 1106
Columbia, SC 29201

Ed Curlee*
Executive Director for Secondary Education
Horry County School District
1605 Horry Street
Conway, SC 29528-6005

Lee D'Andrea
Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum &
Instruction
Anderson County School District 4
315 East Queen Street
Pendleton, SC 29670

W. Rutledge Dingle
Principal
Sumter High School
2580 McCrays Mill Road
Sumter, SC 29154

Kay Gossett
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
Lexington County School District 2
715 Ninth Street
West Columbia, SC 29169

Paul Horne, Jr.
Director of Curriculum & Program Review
SC Education Oversight Committee
POB 11867
Columbia, SC 29211

*Did not attend January 10, 2006 Meeting

Porter Kennington

Principal
North Myrtle Beach High School
3750 Sea Mountain Highway
Little River, SC 29466

Bernard McDaniel
Principal
Hannah-Pamplico High School
2055 South Pamplico Highway
Pamplico, SC 29583

Karen Neal
Principal
Woodruff High School
710 Cross Anchor Highway
Woodruff, SC 29388

David Potter
Director of Research
SC Education Oversight Committee
POB 11867
Columbia, SC 29211

Terry Pruitt
Superintendent of Schools
Hampton County School District 1
410 East Pine Street
Varnville, SC 29944

J. Robb Streeter
Principal Specialist
Cross High School
1293 Old Highway 6
Cross, SC 29436-3578

William Jay Ward
Principal
Ridge Spring-Monetta High School
10 JP Kneece Drive
Monetta, SC 29841

Steve Wilson
Principal
WJ Keenan High School
3455 Pine Belt Road
Columbia, SC 29204

APPENDIX C

Definitions and Formulas for School or District Profile Information

Contents

Definitions and Formulas for School or District Profile Information

Academic Plans, Students On	C-5
Academic Probation, Students On.....	C-5
Accreditation, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools	C-6
Adult Education/GED Programs, Students Completing	C-6
Adult Education/GED Programs, Students Enrolled	C-7
Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Participation Rate	C-7
Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Success Rate	C-8
Advanced Degrees, Teachers with	C-8
Arts, Opportunities in the	C-9
Attendance Rate, Students, Average Daily.....	C-10
Attendance Rate, Teachers, Average Daily	C-10
Average Teacher Salary	C-11
Board Orientation Training, Percent New Trustees Completing	C-11
Character Education Program	C-12
Continuing Contracts, Teachers	C-13
Disabilities Other Than Speech, Students with.....	C-13
Dollars Spent per Pupil	C-14
Dropout Rate.....	C-14
Enrollment in School/District	C-15
Enrollment in Career Technology Courses, Comprehensive High Schools.....	C-15
Enrollment at Career Technology Centers.....	C-15
Expenditures, Percentage Spent on Teacher Salaries	C-16
Facilities, Average Age, District	C-17
Full-Day Kindergarten, First Graders Who Attended	C-17
Gifted and Talented Services, Students State Eligible	C-18
Governance, School District	C-18
Graduation Rate.....	C-18
High School Credit Courses, Seventh and Eighth Grade Students Enrolled.....	C-19
Instruction, Percent Funding Expended on Classroom.....	C-20
LIFE Scholarship, Percentage Seniors Eligible for	C-20
Older Than Usual for Grade, Students	C-21
Organizations, Participation in Co-Curricular Career Technology	C-21
Parents Attending Conferences	C-22
Percentage of Student Records Matched	C-22
Portable Classrooms, District.....	C-23
Prime Instructional Time	C-23
Principal's Years at School	C-24
Professional Development Days, Teachers.....	C-24
Ratio Core Subjects, Student-Teacher	C-24
Retention, Student	C-26
Salaries, Administrative Comparisons	C-26
Schools, Alternative	C-27
Schools, Charter	C-27
Schools, Magnet	C-27
Superintendent's Years in Office, District.....	C-28
Suspensions or Expulsions for Violent and/or Criminal Offenses, Out-of-School.....	C-28

Teachers, Highly Qualified.....	C-29
Teachers Returning From the Previous School Year	C-29
Teachers on Emergency or Provisional Certificates	C-30
Vacancies, More than Nine Weeks, Teacher.....	C-30
Work-Based Experiences, Students	C-31

Students on Academic Plans

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the percentage of grade four through eight students at this school/district that have state-required individualized plans for improvement of student academic performance.

Formula

School

- (1) Determine the total number of students in grades four through eight who have state-required individual academic plans in the school.
- (2) Divide the sum by the total enrollment in grades four through eight at the school.

District

- (1) Determine the total number of students in grades four through eight who have state-required individual academic plans in the district.
- (2) Divide the sum by the total enrollment in grades four through eight in the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

November 15

Students on Academic Probation

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the percentage of students in grades five through eight in danger of repeating current grade level because of low/poor performance in classroom and/or standardized assessments.

Formula

School

- (1) Determine the total number of students at school designated as being in danger of repeating current grade level assignment because of low/poor performance in classroom and/or standardized assessments.
- (2) Divide by the total number of students enrolled in grades five through eight at the school.

District

- (1) Determine the total number of students in district designated as being in danger of repeating current grade level assignment because of low/poor performance in classroom and/or standardized assessments.
- (2) Divide by the total number of students enrolled in grades five through eight in the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

November 15

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Accreditation

DEFINITION:

General

School Report Card: School is/is not accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

District Report Card: Percentage of schools in the district accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Formula

School: Accreditation is indicated with a "Yes" or "No."

District: The number of accredited schools is divided by the total number of schools in the district and converted to a percentage.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education

Reported by:

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Timeframe:

Periodic

Number of Students Completing Adult Education Diploma or GED Preparation Programs

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the number of students receiving a GED or a diploma through adult education programs.

Formula

Determine the number of students age 16 or older by July 1 who received 12 or more hours of instruction, and were assessed between July 1 and June 30 who completed requirements for a GED or a high school diploma through adult education programs in the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Adult Education

Reported by:

Adult education directors

Timeframe:

End of school year

Number of Students Enrolled in Adult Education Diploma or GED Preparation Programs

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the number of students enrolled in adult education diploma or GED preparation programs.

Formula

Determine the total unduplicated count of the number of students aged 16 or older by July 1 enrolled in adult education diploma or GED preparation programs in the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Adult Education

Reported by:

Adult education directors

Timeframe:

End of school year

Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Participation Rate

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the participation rate as the unduplicated count of students enrolled in AP or IB courses divided by the forty-five-day average daily membership (ADM), expressed as a percent.

Formula

Present this indicator as a ratio.

- (1) Determine the unduplicated number of students in grades 11 and 12 enrolled in Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) classes at the school.
- (2) Divide the count in step one by the one-hundred-thirty-five-day ADM for grades 11 and 12 and express as a percent.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

January–March: Precode

Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Scores: Educational Testing Service (ETS) reported to schools in July each year

Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate (AP/IB) Success Rate

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the success rate in Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) courses as the percentage of all AP and IB examinations taken in which the scores were three or above on the AP tests, or four or above on the IB examinations.

Formula

Present this indicator as a percent.

- (1) Determine the count of AP or IB tests at the school with scores of three or above on the AP tests, or four or above on the IB examinations.
- (2) Divide the count in step one above by the number of AP and IB tests taken and express the answer as a percentage.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

January–March: Precode

Advanced Placement/International Baccalaureate Scores: Educational Testing Service (ETS) reported to schools in July each year

Teachers with Advanced Degrees

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the percentage of teachers with earned degrees above the bachelor's.

Formula

School

- (1) Determine the total number of teachers at the school with master's degrees and above.
- (2) Divide the sum by the total number of teachers in the school.

District

- (1) Determine the total number of teachers in the district with master's degrees and above.
- (2) Divide the sum by the total number of teachers in the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts via Professional Certification System

Timeframe:

190 day

Opportunities in the Arts

DEFINITION:

General

The number of arts disciplines offered in a school and the percentage of arts classes taught by teachers certified in the arts discipline (music, visual art, drama, dance).

Formula

Category A: Number of arts disciplines offered during school year, including those offered through interactive technology.

Elementary schools: During the school day for at least an average of thirty minutes per arts disciplines each week.

Middle/High School: For a minimum of one semester credit/unit.

<u>Option</u>	<u>Point Value</u>
0 or 1 discipline	1
2 disciplines	4
3 disciplines	7
4 disciplines	8

Category B: Percentage of the arts disciplines taught by teachers certified in the arts discipline(s) they are teaching (defined the same at all school levels).

<u>Option</u>	<u>Point Value</u>
Less than 50%	1
50%	2
75%	3
100%	4

Total Score: $\frac{A+B}{2}$

Interpretation of Total Scores

Poor = 2.5 or below
Fair = 2.6–3.5
Good = 3.6–4.9
Excellent = 5 or above

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

Average Daily Attendance Rate, Students

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the average number of students present on each day.

Formula

- (1) Determine the total number of days present for students in the school on the 135th day.
- (2) Divide this amount by the number of days students were enrolled at the school.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Finance

Reported by:

School district financial reports

Timeframe:

135-day data collection

Average Daily Attendance Rate, Teachers

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the average percentage of teachers present on each school day.

Formula

School

- (1) Total the number of days present for teachers in the school. (Annual leave days for teachers in state special schools are excluded.)
- (2) Multiply number of teachers by 190 contract days (or number of contract days).
- (3) Divide step one by step two.

Itinerant teachers should be included in calculations proportionate to assignment.

Until the teacher contract year reaches 195 days, teacher absences for professional development activities for which the district or school has paid a stipend or registration fee or activities teachers attend with permission from a school or district administrator are excused from the absence calculation. All activities that are excused must meet state-adopted standards for professional development.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

Department of Education, Office of Research/Office of Finance

Reported by:

School district survey

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

Average Teacher Salary

DEFINITION:

General

School

This indicator reports the average salary of teachers at the school. This average is compared to the state average teacher salary on the school report card.

District

This indicator reports the average salary of teachers in the district. This average is compared to the state average teacher salary on the district report card.

Formula

School

(1) Add the salaries of the total full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers assigned to the school (based on 190 days).

(2) Divide the sum by the total FTE teachers assigned to the school (based on 190 days).

District

(1) Add the salaries of the total FTE teachers assigned to the district (based on 190 days).

(2) Divide the sum by the total FTE teachers assigned to the district (based on 190 days).

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Finance

Reported by:

District financial officers

Timeframe:

135-day data collection

Percent New Trustees Completing Board Orientation Training

DEFINITION:

General

Reports the percentage of newly elected school board trustees who have completed the orientation program for new school board trustees. Reported on district report card.

Formula

The number of new trustees who have completed the training is divided by the total number of new trustees and converted to a percentage.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

Periodic

Character Education Program

DEFINITION:

General

The character development of students and staff in the school is measured using a rubric developed by the S.C. Character Education Partnership Team.

Formula

The scores from the rubric are converted to ratings based on the following scale points:

Rating Terms	Point Scale
Excellent	3.6 to 4.0
Good	2.6 to 3.5
Average	1.6 to 2.5
Below Average	.6 to 1.5
Unsatisfactory	0 to .5

Definitions of Rating Terms

Excellent: The school has a comprehensive character development initiative that ensures that all students and staff perform to their maximum potential.

Good: The school has a comprehensive character development initiative that is producing results among students and staff.

Average: The school is addressing character development, but its efforts are not comprehensive.

Below Average: The school is developing the structure needed to begin a character development initiative.

Unsatisfactory: The school is not actively engaged in addressing the character development of its students or staff.

PROCEDURE:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Safe Schools and Youth Services

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

Spring data collection

Teachers with Continuing Contract Status

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports on the percentage of teachers in the school/district with continuing contract status.

Formula

School

Divide the total number of full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers at the school with continuing contract status during the ratings year by the total number of FTE teachers in the school.

District

Divide the total number of FTE teachers in the district with continuing contract status during the school year of the report card data collection by the total number of FTE teachers in the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Certification

Reported by:

School districts

Professional Certification System

Timeframe:

End of school year

Percentage of Students with Disabilities Other Than Speech

DEFINITION:

General

The percentage of students qualifying under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and receiving services in programs for students with disabilities (excluding students receiving speech services only).

Formula

School

- (1) Determine the total number of students at the school qualifying under IDEA and receiving services in programs for students with disabilities (excluding students receiving speech services).
- (2) Divide the total by the number of students enrolled at the school.

District

- (1) Determine the total number of students enrolled in the district qualifying under IDEA and receiving services in programs for students with disabilities (excluding students receiving speech services).
- (2) Divide the total by the number of students enrolled at the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School district, SASI, Precode data

Timeframe:

January–March

Dollars Spent per Pupil

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the federal, state, and district funds spent for the education of each student during the most recent school year.

Formula

School

(1) Determine annual operating expenses for all school activities. Include In\$ite™ categories for instruction, instructional support, operations, and leadership. Exclude expenses for capital outlay and debt service categories.

(2) Divide the sum by the average daily membership (ADM) of the school.

District

(1) Determine annual operating expenses for all district activities. Include In\$ite™ categories for instruction, instructional support, operations, and leadership. Exclude expenses for capital outlay and debt service categories.

(2) Divide the sum by the average daily membership (ADM) of the district.

Note: Footnote on report card with statement "Prior year's financial data."

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Finance

Reported by:

School district financial officers

Timeframe:

135-day data collection

Note: These data are for the year preceding the ratings year.

Annual Dropout Rate

DEFINITION:

General

This fact provides information on the annual rate of students who leave the school or district for any reason, other than death, prior to graduation or completion of a course of studies without transferring to another school, district, or institution, divided by the total number of students enrolled at the school (grades seven through twelve) (SDE guidelines).

Formula

School/district (grades seven through twelve only)

Calculated for each school/district with grades seven through twelve (overall).

(1) Determine the number of students who dropped out of school during the previous school year (as per SDE guidelines).

(2) Add the number of students who failed to return after the summer.

(3) Divide the sum of step one and step two by the total number of students enrolled on the last day of school during the previous school year.

Note: Data will be two years behind.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Career and Technology Education

Reported by:

School district

Timeframe:

Forty-fifth day of the following school year

Enrollment in School/District

DEFINITION:

General

Total number of students enrolled in grades Pre-K (3- and 4-year old programs) through 12 in the school/district on the forty-fifth day of school.

Formula

School

Determine the student count for the total number of students enrolled in grades Pre-K through 12 in the school on the forty-fifth day of school.

District

Determine the student count for the total number of students enrolled in the district in grades Pre-K through 12 on the forty-fifth day of school.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School district

Timeframe:

January–March

Enrollment in Career Technology Courses at Comprehensive High Schools

DEFINITION:

General

The total number of students that are enrolled in career technology (occupational) courses at the comprehensive high school. Each course must meet a minimum of 250 minutes weekly.

Formula

Determine the total number of students that are enrolled in career technology courses of study at the comprehensive high school on the forty-fifth day of school.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

Office of Career and Technology Education

Reported by:

School district, SASI, Precode data

Timeframe:

January–March

Enrollment at Career Technology Centers

DEFINITION:

General

The number of students enrolled in classes at the career technology center.

Formula

Determine total number of students enrolled at the career technology center on the forty-fifth day.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Career and Technology Education

Reported by:

Career technology center directors

Timeframe: Forty-five-day data collection

Percentage of Expenditures Spent on Teacher Salaries

DEFINITION:

General

This fact provides information on the percentage of per student expenditures spent on teacher, instructional assistant, and substitute salaries.

Formula

School

- (1) Add teacher salaries, instructional assistant salaries, and substitute teacher pay for the year of the report card data (school).
- (2) Divide by the total dollars spent per students.

District

- (1) Add teacher salaries, instructional assistant salaries, and substitute teacher pay for the year of the report card data (district).
- (2) Divide by the total dollars spent per student.

Note: Footnote on report card with statement "Prior year's financial data."

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Finance

Reported by:

School district financial officers

Timeframe:

135-day data collection

Note: Data will be one year behind.

Average Age of Facilities in the District*

DEFINITION:

General

The average age (years since construction) of all school facilities in the district.

Formula

- (1) Determine the age of each school facility in the district by weighting the age of each building and addition by the square footage.
- (2) Total the square feet years (since construction) for all school facilities in the district.
- (3) Divide the sum (step two) by the total square footage of school facilities in the district.

*Buildings used for the instruction of students.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Facilities

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

Percentage of First Graders Who Attended Full-day Kindergarten

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the percentage of first graders at the school who participated in full-day kindergarten programs.

Formula

- (1) Determine the total number of first-grade students at the school site who participated in full-day kindergarten programs (public, private if available).
- (2) Divide the total by the total number of students enrolled at the school.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Early Childhood

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

Summer data collection

Students Eligible for State Gifted and Talented Services

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the percentage of students who meet the state guidelines for receiving gifted and talented services.

Formula

School

- (1) Determine the number of students (grades three through ten) at the school who qualify to receive gifted and talented services as per state-identified guidelines.
- (2) Divide the sum by the total number of students enrolled in grades three through ten at the school.

District

- (1) Determine the number of students (grades three through ten) in the district who qualify to receive gifted and talented services as per state-identified guidelines.
- (2) Divide the sum by the total number of students enrolled in grades three through ten in the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

Office of Research, Office of Finance

Reported by:

School districts

Precode reporting process

Timeframe:

January–March

Governance, School District

DEFINITION:

General

Reports the type of governance for the school district. Reported on district report card.

Formula

The following information is reported:

- ☐ board membership: number of trustees and election/selection method;
- ☐ fiscal authority: governing body with authority to levy and expend funds;
- ☐ average hours of training annually: number of hours provided to school board trustees divided by the total number of trustees and converted to a percentage.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

Periodic

4-Year Graduation Rate

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the percentage of original ninth-grade students who earn standard high school diplomas who graduate in four years or less (i.e., on time). Include data from students who meet the state diploma requirements as a result of attending summer school following their senior year in the calculation of the graduation rate.

Formula

School/District

(1) Student Count

Ninth-grade student count for school year beginning four years before year of graduation.

(Count is taken from ninth-grade master classification list.) _____

Subtract ninth-grade repeaters - _____

Subtract all students who transferred out of school/district - _____

(Adjustment made only for documental transfers to state diploma-granting program.)

Add all students who transferred into school/district + _____

Total number of students = _____

(2) Diplomas Issued

Total number of diplomas = _____

(3) 4-year Graduation Rate

Divide (step two by step one), convert to percentage _____

NOTE: Graduation rates published on the S.C. school and district report cards may be higher than the actual rates because of incomplete data on students who are no longer enrolled in the school or district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

Addendum: After summer school

Percentage of Seventh and Eighth Grade Students in High School Credit Courses

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the percentage of seventh and eighth grade students that enroll in courses for high school credit.

Formula

(1) Determine the total number of students enrolled on forty-fifth day in grades seven and eight enrolled in courses for high school credit

(2) Divide the total by the number of seventh and eighth graders enrolled at the school on the forty-fifth day.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe: January–March

Percent Funding Expended on Classroom Instruction

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the percentage of school district funding expended on classroom instruction.

Formula

Determine the percentage of district total operating expenses listed in the InSite™ database expended for the category "Instruction."

Note: Footnote on report card with statement "Prior year's financial data."

PROCEDURES

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Finance

Reported by:

School district financial officers

Timeframe:

135-day data collection

Note: These data are for the year preceding the ratings year.

Percentage Seniors Eligible for LIFE Scholarship

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the percentage of high school seniors meeting the eligibility requirements for the LIFE Scholarship

Formula

Determine the number of high school seniors meeting the eligibility requirements promulgated by the Commission on Higher Education, divide by the number of seniors enrolled, and convert to a percentage.

PROCEDURES

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research; Office of Finance

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

135-day data collection

Summer report card data collection

Students Older Than Usual for Grade (Two or More Years)

DEFINITION:

General

This fact provides information on the percentage of students who are two or more years over age for grade.

Formula

- (1) Determine the total number of students enrolled at forty-fifth day who are two or more years older than the typical age of pupils at student's current grade assignment (September 1 as reference date for students born in 1991 or later; November 1 as the reference date for students born prior to 1991).
- (2) Divide the sum by the total number of students enrolled at the school on the forty-fifth day.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts
Precode testing file

Timeframe:

January–March

Participation in Co-Curricular Career Technology Organizations

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the percentage of students attending career technology centers or comprehensive high schools that participate in career technology co-curricular organizations.

Formula

Career Technology Centers

- (1) Determine the unduplicated number of students at the career technology center that participate in school-related clubs/organizations (VICA, FBLA, FHA, HERO, DECA, HOSA, TSA, FFA).
- (2) Divide the sum by the total number of students enrolled at the school on the forty-fifth day of school.

Comprehensive High School

- (1) Determine the unduplicated number of students at the comprehensive high school that participate in school-related clubs/organizations (VICA, FBLA, FHA, HERO, DECA, HOSA, TSA, FFA).
- (2) Divide the sum by the total number of students enrolled in career technology courses on the forty-fifth day of school.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Career and Technology Education

Reported by:

School district career technology coordinators, directors

Timeframe:

End of school year

Parents Attending Conferences

DEFINITION:

General

The percentage of students in the school whose parents/guardians participate in or attended an individual parent conference and/or an academic plan conference. Conferences include face-to-face, telephone, and two-way e-mail conferences.

Formula

- (1) Count the number of students in the school whose parents/guardians attended at least one individual parent conference (unduplicated count) or an academic plan conference during the school year.
- (2) Divide the total number of students in the school whose parents/guardians attended at least one individual parent conference or an academic plan conference at the school (step one) by the total number of students enrolled at the school on the 135th day of school.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

Percentage of Student Records Matched

DEFINITION:

General

This fact provides information on the degree to which student PACT test records were matched longitudinally from the previous year to the current year. The matched student test records are used for the calculation of the school and district Improvement Rating.

Formula

Calculated for each school in which PACT-tested grade levels are housed and for each school district.

- (1) Determine the number of students enrolled in the same school (or district) on the 45th day of school and on the first day of testing for whom the current-year PACT test data are successfully matched with the individual student test data from the previous school year.
- (2) Divide the total from step one by the total number of students enrolled in the same school (or district) on the 45th day of school and on the first day of testing for whom current-year PACT test data are available for matching. In the case of grade 3, in which only those repeating third grade may reasonably be expected to have pretest information, the pool of data available for matching a third grade posttest will include only those students identified as repeating grade 3 in the current year.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Assessment and Office of Research

Reported by:

School district

Timeframe:

Summer of current school year

Percentage of Portable Classrooms in the District

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the number of portable (relocatable units)* classrooms (shown as a percentage of the total classrooms).

Formula

- (1) Determine the number of classrooms classified as portable structures (relocatable units)* in the district during the school year for which data is being reported.
- (2) Divide by the total number of classrooms.

*Designation given in *Statewide Summary Capital Needs, 1998–99*, State Department of Education, Office of Facilities

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Facilities

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

Prime Instructional Time

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator provides information on the percentage of instructional time available when both teachers and students are present.

Formula

- (1) Calculate teacher attendance rate for Prime Instructional Time calculation (TAPRIME):

$$\text{TAPRIME} = 100 * ((\text{TOTDAYS} * (180/190)) - \text{TCHABS}) / (\text{TOTDAYS} * (180/190)), \text{ where}$$

TOTDAYS= total days of employment and

TCHABS=(days of long-term absences + days of short-term absences + days of absence due to special circumstances + days of absence due to professional development on days students attend school) – NOSCHOOL, where

NOSCHOOL=days of absence on days of employment that are not days students are expected to attend school

- (2) Calculate prime instructional time (PRIME):

$$\text{PRIME} = (\text{STUATTEND} + \text{TAPRIME}) - 100, \text{ where}$$

STUATTEND= student attendance rate expressed as a percentage.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts

SASI pupil accounting system

End-of-year attendance survey

Timeframe:

End of school year

Principal's or Director's Years at School or Center

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the length of time that the principal or director has been assigned to the school or center as a principal or director.

Formula

Total the principal's or director's actual length of time at the school or center:

Ninety days or less = .5 year; more than ninety days = 1 year

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Professional Certification System

Reported by:

District superintendent

Timeframe:

End of school year

Professional Development Days, Teachers

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the average number of professional development days per teacher.

Formula

- (1) Multiply the number of professional staff paid on the teacher salary schedule by the five statutory days for professional development.
- (2) Add the product of the number of additional days (in which each day must consist of at least 6 hours of instruction) for which the district or school has paid a stipend, or registration fee, or the teacher has permission from school or district administrator for professional development that meets the state-adopted standards (conference attendance does not meet the standards) by the number of teachers participating. Until the teacher contract year reaches 195 days, this formula may include activities occurring on instructional days.
- (3) Divide the sum of step one and step two by the total number of professional staff in item one.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

Student-Teacher Ratio for Core Subjects (Each Class)

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the average student-teacher ratio for English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies classes.

Formula

Grades K–5

- (1) Determine the number of students enrolled at the school (excluding students enrolled in self-contained special education classes) on the forty-fifth day of school.

- (2) Determine the total number of teachers in the school (excluding counselors, librarians, administrators, specialists, and teachers of art, music, physical education, or special education).
- (3) Determine the number of self-contained students with disabilities enrolled in the school on forty-fifth day.
- (4) Determine the total number of teachers of self-contained special education classes at the school.
- (5) Find the total number of students: $\#1 + \#3$.
- (6) Find the student-teacher ratio in "regular" core classes: $\#1 / \#2$.
- (7) Find the student-teacher ratio in self-contained classes for the disabled: $\#3 / \#4$.
- (8) Find the sum of the student-teacher ratios, weighted by the proportion of students: $[(\#1 / \#5) * \#6] + [(\#3 / \#5) * \#7]$.

Grades 6–12

- (1) Determine the unduplicated number of students (excluding students enrolled in self-contained special education classes) enrolled in math, English language arts, science, and social studies classes on the forty-fifth day of school.
- (2) Determine the number of FTE classroom teachers of English language arts, math, science, and social studies at the school.
- (3) Determine the number of self-contained students with disabilities enrolled in the school on forty-fifth day.
- (4) Determine the total number of teachers of self-contained special education classes at the school.
- (5) Find the total number of students: $\#1 + \#3$.
- (6) Find the student-teacher ratio in "regular" core classes: $\#1 / \#2$.
- (7) Find the student-teacher ratio in self-contained classes for the disabled: $\#3 / \#4$.
- (8) Find the sum of the student teacher ratios, weighted by the proportion of students: $[(\#1 / \#5) * \#6] + [(\#3 / \#5) * \#7]$.

District

- (1) Determine the number of students enrolled in kindergarten through grade five in the district on forty-fifth day (excluding students enrolled in self-contained special education classes).
- (2) Determine the number of students in grades six through twelve (excluding students enrolled in self-contained special education classes) enrolled in math, English language arts, science, and social studies classes in district on forty-fifth day.
- (3) Determine the total number of teachers in the district (excluding counselors, librarians, administrators, specialists, and teachers of art, music, physical education, or special education).
- (4) Determine the number of self-contained students with disabilities enrolled in the school district on forty-fifth day.
- (5) Determine the total number of teachers of self-contained special education classes at the district.
- (6) Find the total number of students in the district: $\#1 + \#2 + \#4$.
- (7) Find the student:teacher ratio in "regular" core classes: $(\#1 + \#2) / \#3$.
- (8) Find the student:teacher ration in self-contained classes for the disabled: $\#4 / \#5$.
- (9) Find the sum of the student:teacher ratios, weighted by the proportions of students: $\{[(\#1 + \#2) / \#6] * \#7\} + [(\#4 / \#6) * \#8]$.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts—SASI

Timeframe

January–March

Student Retention

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the percentage of students required to repeat grade levels because of poor grades, low test scores, and/or teacher judgment in the last completed school year.

Formula

Grades K–8

School

- (1) Determine the total number of students classified at the same grade level for two consecutive years (kindergarten through eighth grade).
- (2) Divide the sum by the total student enrollment (kindergarten through eighth grade) at the school on the forty-fifth day.

District

- (1) Determine the total number of students classified at the same grade level for consecutive years (kindergarten through eighth grade).
- (2) Divide the sum by the total student enrollment (kindergarten through eighth grade) at the school on the forty-fifth day.

Grades 9–12

School

- (1) Determine the total number of students enrolled on forty-fifth day not earning enough units to be classified at the next grade level in the school.
- (2) Divide the sum by the number of students enrolled in the school on the forty-fifth day.

District

- (1) Determine the total number of students not earning enough units to be classified at the next grade level in the district.
- (2) Divide the sum by the number of students enrolled in the district on the forty-fifth day.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School district, Precode reporting

Timeframe

January–March

Average Administrative Salary Comparisons

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the average salary of administrators in the district. The average district salary is compared to national and state average salary for these educators.

Formula

- (1) Determine the aggregate salaries of administrators in the district (paid on administrative schedule).
- (2) Divide the sum by the total number of administrators in the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Finance

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

Number of Alternative Schools in the District

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the total number of alternative schools in the district accredited through the State Department of Education, Office of Organizational Development.

Formula

Determine the number of alternative schools in the district accredited through the State Department of Education, Office of Organizational Development.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of School Quality

Reported by:

District pupil accounting system, SASI

Timeframe:

End of school year

Number of Charter Schools in the District

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the total number of charter schools in the district. Under state law, a charter school is "a public, non-sectarian, non-religious, non-home-based, non-profit corporation forming a school which operates within a public school district."

Formula

Determine the number of charter schools in the district that have been approved for operation by the local school board or the State Board of Education.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of School Quality

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

Number of Magnet Schools in the District

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the total number of magnet schools in the district accredited through the State Department of Education, Office of Organizational Development.

Formula

Determine the number of magnet schools in the district accredited through the State Department of Education, Office of Organizational Development.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of School Quality

Reported by:

District pupil accounting system, SASI

Timeframe:

End of school year

District Superintendent's Years in Office

DEFINITION:

General

The number of years that the current district superintendent has held that position.

Formula

Determine the length of time the superintendent has been in office. The total time should be reported in years.

Ninety days or less = .5 year; more than ninety days = 1 year.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School district

Timeframe:

End of school year

Out-of-School Suspensions or Expulsions for Violent and/or Criminal Offenses

DEFINITION:

General

This fact provides information on the percentage of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical violence and/or criminal offenses.

Formula

School

- (1) Determine the unduplicated count of students dismissed from school (out-of-school suspensions and expulsions) for incidents occurring on school grounds, on school transportation, or at school-sponsored events, to include: 1. Aggravated Assault; 2. Simple Assault; 3. Intimidation; 4. Drug Violations; 5. Larceny/Theft; 6. Liquor Law Violations; 7. Disturbing Schools (bomb threats, false fire alarms, disorderly conduct); 8. Vandalism; 9. Weapons Possessions; 10. Sex Offenses; 11. Arson; 12. Robbery; 13. Burglary/Breaking and Entering; 14. Vehicle Theft; 15. Homicide; 16. Other Criminal Offenses.
- (2) Divide the count from step one above by the 45-day ADM and express as a percentage.

District

- (1) Determine the unduplicated count of students dismissed from school (out-of-school suspensions and expulsions) for incidents occurring on school grounds, on school transportation, or at school-sponsored events, to include: 1. Aggravated Assault; 2. Simple Assault; 3. Intimidation; 4. Drug Violations; 5. Larceny/Theft; 6. Liquor Law Violations; 7. Disturbing Schools (bomb threats, false fire alarms, disorderly conduct); 8. Vandalism; 9. Weapons Possessions; 10. Sex Offenses; 11. Arson; 12. Robbery; 13. Burglary/Breaking and Entering; 14. Vehicle Theft; 15. Homicide; 16. Other Criminal Offenses.
- (2) Divide the count from step one above by the 45-day ADM and express as a percentage.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education

Reported by:

School districts and individual schools

Timeframe:

End of school year

Teachers, Highly Qualified

DEFINITION

General

The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified based on criteria outlined in No Child Left Behind legislation.

Formula

Highly qualified teachers have:

- Earned at least a bachelor's degree;
- Demonstrated content knowledge in each core area he/she teaches;
- Obtained full State certification without any waivers of requirements.

Specific definitions are outlined in the SDE publication, Identifying Highly Qualified Teachers, available from the Office of Teacher Quality.

PROCEDURE

Collected By

State Department of Education, Office of Teacher Preparation, Support, and Assessment

State Department of Education, Office of Technology

Reported By

School Districts

Timeframe: End of school year.

Teachers Returning from the Previous School Year

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator provides information on the percentage of classroom teachers returning to the school/district from the previous school year for a three-year period.

Formula

School (Note: Not calculated for schools that have been in operation for less than four years.)

- (1) Determine total number of teachers assigned to school in year previous to ratings performance year.
- (2) Determine number of teachers who returned in the ratings year.
- (3) Divide step two by step one.
- (4) Average the result yielded in step three for the preceding three-year period.

District

Total number of certified teachers assigned to each school in the district during the school year prior to report card distribution.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School districts, Professional Certification System

Timeframe:

End of school year

Teachers on Emergency or Provisional Certificates

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the percentage of teachers who do not have full teaching certification.

Formula

- (1) Determine the total number of teachers.
- (2) Determine the number of teachers with emergency or provisional certificates.
- (3) Divide step two by step one and convert to a percentage.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Teacher Certification

Reported by:

School district

Timeframe:

End of school year

Teacher Vacancies Unfilled for More Than Nine Weeks

DEFINITION:

General

This indicator reports the percentage of teaching positions that remain unfilled for more than nine weeks.

Formula

- (1) Determine the number of classroom teacher positions, excluding media specialists and guidance counselors, that remained unfilled by certified teachers under contract for more than nine weeks.
- (2) Divide the total by the number of classroom teacher positions, excluding media specialists and guidance counselors, in the district.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Research

Reported by:

School district

Timeframe:

End of school year

Students in Work-Based Experiences

DEFINITION:

General

This fact reports the percentage of students involved with in-depth learning experiences at a work site providing students with work-related knowledge and skills (youth apprenticeships, registered apprenticeships, cooperative education, mentoring, shadowing, internships, and service learning).

Formula

Career Technology Centers

- (1) Determine the total number of students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 participating in structured experiences with an outside agency or business (types listed in general definition).
- (2) Divide the total (step one) by the total number of students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 at the center on the forty-fifth day of school.

Comprehensive High Schools

- (1) Determine the total number of students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 that participate in structured experiences with an outside agency or business.
- (2) Divide the total (step one) by the total number of students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 at the high school.

PROCEDURES:

Collected by:

State Department of Education, Office of Career and Technology Education

Reported by:

School districts

Timeframe:

End of school year

APPENDIX D

Table of Specifications by School or District for Report Card Data

**APPENDIX D
TABLE OF SPECIFICATIONS**

Data for each noted item should be included in the school or district report card
for a school or district enrolling students in the designated grades

Element	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Career / Tech	Charter	Alternative	Special	District
Title Page																		
School/district name, Address Principal, superintendent, and board chairman names Telephone numbers	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fiscal authority																		•
Grades and total enrollment (PreK through 12)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Absolute and Improvement Ratings	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Adequate Yearly Progress	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Similar schools/districts—Absolute Ratings	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Improvement incentive—HUGs				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
S.C. Performance Goal	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
SDE and EOC website addresses	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Achievement Performance Page(s)																		
School/district name	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Performance trends	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Critical definitions • PACT performance levels	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Percent student records matched					•	•	•	•	•									•
Graphic display (pie charts) • State assessment data, by content area • Distribution among the four performance levels (PACT) • This school/district • Schools/districts with students like ours				•	•	•	•	•	•						As applicable to the program			•
Table display • Percentage of students scoring Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, or Advanced by grade level and content area for the current year and previous year (PACT) • Number tested • Percent not tested				•	•	•	•	•	•						•	•	•	•

Element	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Career / Tech	Charter	Alternative	Special	District
Table display <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students scoring pass (score of "2" or above) on 2, 1, or 0 subtests on first attempt on HSAP current year and previous two classes This school/district Schools/districts with students like ours 										●	●	●	●		As applicable to the program			●
Table display <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students at each performance level on each HSAP subtest (first attempt) Disaggregated student performance in the following categories: all, gender, racial/ethnic, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and socioeconomic status Number tested Percent not tested State objective 										●	●	●	●		As applicable to the program			●
Table display <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longitudinal HSAP passage rate for current senior class Disaggregated student performance in the following categories: all, gender, racial/ethnic, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and socioeconomic status 										●	●	●	●		As applicable to the program			●
Table display <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graduation rate (percent) Disaggregated student performance in the following categories: all, gender, racial/ethnic, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and socioeconomic status Met state objective 										●	●	●	●		As applicable to the program			●
Table display <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graduation rate (percent) Number of students This school/district Schools/districts with students like ours 										●	●	●	●		As applicable to the program			●
Table display <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longitudinal Exit Exam passage rate This school/district Schools/districts with students like ours 										●	●	●	●		As applicable to the program			●

Element	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Career / Tech	Charter	Alternative	Special	District
Table display <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of end-of-course tests having passing scores (70 or above) across subjects and courses This school/district Schools/districts with students like ours 								•	•	•	•	•	•		As applicable to the program			•
Display of Performance SAT and ACT by verbal, math, and composite scores detailing district, state, and national performance for two years																		•
PK-2 Only Schools																		
• Prime instructional time	•	•	•												As applicable to the program			
• Parent involvement	•	•	•												As applicable to the program			
• Student-teacher ratio	•	•	•												As applicable to the program			
• Early childhood school accreditation by external group [group(s) accrediting school indicated]	•	•	•												As applicable to the program			
• Professional development time devoted to early childhood	•	•	•												As applicable to the program			
• Percentage teachers returning from previous school year	•	•	•															
• Percentage teachers with advanced degrees	•	•	•															
Career/Technology																		
• Percentage of career/technology students mastering core competencies														•				
• Percentage of career/technology students receiving diploma														•				
• Percentage of career/technology completers placed														•				
Table display <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core competencies, graduated, placement Disaggregated student performance in the following categories: all, gender, racial/ethnic, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and socioeconomic status 														•				
Descriptions of career/technology terms										•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

Element		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Career/ Tech	Charter	Alternative	Special	District
Profile Page(s)	Note: These data are displayed for our school, schools with students like ours, and the state median for schools at the same level. The change from the previous year is shown as well.																		
Students	Percentage AP/IB success										•	•	•	•		As applicable to program			•
	Percentage AP/IB participation										•	•	•	•					•
	Percentage Average daily attendance	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
	Percentage Attended full-day kindergarten		•	•	•	•	•												•
	Percentage Retained	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
	Percentage Annual dropout rate								•	•	•	•	•	•		As appropriate to grade levels		•	•
	Percentage on academic plans					•	•	•	•	•									•
	Percentage On academic probation						•	•	•	•									•
	Percentage Older than usual for grade		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
	Number Adult education diploma or GED preparation programs enrollment																		•
	Number Adult education diploma or GED preparation program completions																		•
	Percentage Out-of school suspensions or expulsions for violent and/or criminal offenses	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•

Element		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Career/ Tech	Charter	Alternative	Special	District
Students	Percentage Enrolled in high school credit courses (grades seven and eight)								•	•									
	Percentage State-eligible gifted and talented services				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				•	•	• (Not GSAH)	•
	Percentage With non-speech disabilities	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Teachers	Percentage Average daily attendance	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Percentage With advanced degrees	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Percentage Continuing contract status	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Percentage Highly qualified teachers	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Percentage On emergency or provisional permits	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Percentage teachers returning from previous school year	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Number Average teacher salary	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Percentage Vacancies for more than nine weeks																		•
	Number Professional development days per teacher	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Element		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Career/ Tech	Charter	Alternative	Special	District
School/ District	School/district name	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Number Dollars spent per student	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Percentage Prime instructional time	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
	Ratio Student-teacher ratio in core subjects	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•
	Percentage Spent on teacher salaries	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Number Superintendent's/principal's years at district/school	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Percentage Parent conferences	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Rating Opportunities in the arts	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	• (Not GSAH)	•
	Yes/No SACS accreditation	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	As applicable to program				
	Rating Character Education Program	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•					
	Percent seniors eligible for LIFE scholarship										•	•	•	•					•
AYP Indicators	Student attendance • State objective • Met state objective	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•					As applicable to program				•
	Graduation rate • Met state objective										•	•	•	•					•
	Highly qualified teachers in low-poverty schools	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Element		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Career / Tech	Charter	Alternative	Special	District
District	Number Total schools in the district																		•
	Number Alternative schools																		•
	Number of charter schools																		•
	Number Magnet schools																		•
	Number Average age of school facilities																		•
	Percentage Portable classrooms																		•
	Dollars Average administrative salary																		•
Career/ Tech	List of district-authorized charter schools and their ratings																		•
	Percentage funds expended on classroom instruction																		•
	Percentage Student participation in career technology/co-curricular clubs/organizations										•	•	•	•	•				
	Number Enrollment career/technology center/courses										•	•	•	•					
	Percentage Students participating in work-based experiences										•	•	•	•	•				
	Percentage Career/technology students mastering core competencies										•	•	•	•	•				
	Percentage Career/technology completers placed										•	•	•	•	•				

Element		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Career / Tech	Charter	Alternative	Special	District
Back Cover	Principal's/SIC director's report	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
	Student, teacher, parent survey results (teacher only for Prek-2 schools)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	
	Critical definitions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School rating terms • Adequate Yearly Progress 	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
	Schools in improvement status																		•
	District superintendent's report																		•
	Board membership elections																		•
	Average hours board training																		•
	New board member orientation training																		•

Total Printing Costs \$11,694.00
Units Printed 1,900
Cost Per Unit \$6.15

The Education Oversight Committee does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or handicap in its practices relating to employment or establishment and administration of its programs and initiatives. Inquiries regarding employment, programs and initiatives of the Committee should be directed to the Executive Director (803) 734-6148.